

Adam's Dust and Adam's Glory in the Hodayot and the Letters of Paul

Supplements to Novum Testamentum

Executive Editors

M.M. Mitchell (*Chicago*)
D.P. Moessner (*Fort Worth*)

Editorial Board

H.W. Attridge (*New Haven*) – C. Breytenbach (*Berlin*)
C. Gerber (*Hamburg*) – J.K. Elliott (*Leeds*)
C.R. Holladay (*Atlanta*) – D. Marguerat (*Lausanne*)
M.J.J. Menken (*Tilburg*) – J.C. Thom (*Stellenbosch*)
P. Trebilco (*Dunedin*) – C.M. Tuckett (*Oxford*)

VOLUME 168

The titles published in this series are listed at *brill.com/nts*

Adam's Dust and Adam's Glory in the Hodayot and the Letters of Paul

Rethinking Anthropogony and Theology

By

Nicholas A. Meyer



BRILL

LEIDEN | BOSTON

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Names: Meyer, Nicholas A., author.

Title: Adam's dust and Adam's glory in the Hodayot and the letters of Paul : rethinking anthropogony and theology / by Nicholas A. Meyer.

Description: Leiden ; Boston : Brill, [2016] | Series: Supplements to Novum Testamentum, ISSN 0167-9732 ; volume 168 | Includes bibliographical references.

Identifiers: LCCN 2016018306 (print) | LCCN 2016019423 (ebook) | ISBN 9789004322912 (hardback : alk. paper) | ISBN 9789004322929 (E-book)

Subjects: LCSH: Adam (Biblical figure) | Thanksgiving Psalms—Criticism, interpretation, etc. | Bible. Epistles of Paul—Criticism, interpretation, etc. | Philosophical theology.

Classification: LCC BS580.A4 M49 2016 (print) | LCC BS580.A4 (ebook) | DDC 233—dc23

LC record available at <https://lcn.loc.gov/2016018306>

Want or need Open Access? Brill Open offers you the choice to make your research freely accessible online in exchange for a publication charge. Review your various options on brill.com/brill-open.

Typeface for the Latin, Greek, and Cyrillic scripts: "Brill". See and download: brill.com/brill-typeface.

ISSN 0167-9732

ISBN 978-90-04-32291-2 (hardback)

ISBN 978-90-04-32292-9 (e-book)

Copyright 2016 by Koninklijke Brill nv, Leiden, The Netherlands.

Koninklijke Brill nv incorporates the imprints Brill, Brill Hes & De Graaf, Brill Nijhoff, Brill Rodopi and Hotei Publishing.

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, translated, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without prior written permission from the publisher.

Authorization to photocopy items for internal or personal use is granted by Koninklijke Brill nv provided that the appropriate fees are paid directly to The Copyright Clearance Center, 222 Rosewood Drive, Suite 910, Danvers, MA 01923, USA. Fees are subject to change.

This book is printed on acid-free paper and produced in a sustainable manner.

Contents

Acknowledgements VII

Abbreviations and Translations VIII

1 Introduction 1

The Questions 1

The Comparison, Its Rationale 2

Issues of Anthropogony in the Hodayot 6

Issues of Anthropogony in Paul 11

Looking Forward 17

2 Adam's Dust and Adam's Glory: Dichotomizing Anthropogonies in the Hodayot 18

Matters of Introduction and Method 18

Creation and the Divine Plan 27

Anthropogony: Adam's Dust 31

Niedrigkeitsdoxologie (and Elendsbetrachtung) 32

The Man of Dust 37

Impurity and Sin: Refracting the Psalms and Job 47

A Mortal in the Presence of its Maker: On a Theme from Job 58

Anthropogony: Adam's Glory 64

Adam's Glory and Eden's Pleasures 65

The Anthropology of Glory and the Self-Glorification Psalm 79

Conclusions 91

3 Adam and the Image of God: Anthropogony outside Romans 95

Male and Female No Longer: Galatians 3:28 95

The Gendered Image of God: 1 Corinthians 11:7–12 105

The Images of Two Men: 1 Corinthians 15:45–50 117

Transformed into the Image: 2 Corinthians 3:18; 4:4, 6 135

The Form of God: Philippians 2:6–11; 3:20–21 147

Adam, Christ, and the Cosmos: 1 Corinthians 15:20–28 162

4 Adam, Corruption, and the Cosmos: Anthropogony within Romans 175

Adam and Christ: Romans 5:12–21 176

Adam, Sin, and Death 176

Adam and Law 184

Adam, the Type 187

	The <i>Adamic</i> “I” and its Encounter with Divine Law:	
	Romans 7:7–12	195
	<i>“No longer Adam and Eve?”</i>	206
	<i>Adam, Innocence, and Law</i>	207
	<i>Adam, Sin, and Flesh</i>	211
	Creation and the Children of God: Romans 8:18–23	215
5	Conclusions on Paul	228
	Romans and the Rest	228
	Anthropogony and Theology in Paul	229
6	Conclusions	232
	Theology and Traditions of Anthropogony	232
	The Hodayot: Implications for Scholarship	233
	The Apostle Paul: Implications for Scholarship	235
	Bibliography	237
	Index of Modern Authors	266
	Index of Ancient Sources	271

Acknowledgements

In the beginning was my dissertation (2013). After some editing and supplementing, it took the form of the book you now hold in your hands (or view on a screen). It is fitting to begin with thanks, therefore, to those who served as my supervisors in the Department of Religious Studies at McMaster University, Professors Stephen Westerholm and Eileen Schuller. Their expertise in Paul and the Hodayot respectively made the topic of this dissertation an obvious choice, a gift waiting in the wings, as it were, needing only to be claimed. The unusual thing about this gift, however, was that it took its distinctive shape in the unwrapping. In that process, their guidance, constructive criticism, and generosity enabled me to develop and hone my own thinking, and I feel tremendously fortunate to have had the privilege to learn from them.

There are many others to thank. Professors Dan Machiela, Grant Macaskill, Carol Newsom, and David Shepherd each read the whole or parts of this work at various stages and in different capacities. Professor John Barclay provided me with an early draft of a chapter on the Hodayot. And Professor Anders Runesson challenged and inspired me in a lasting way in my early career as a graduate student. Friends and colleagues were continual partners in dialogue in matters related to this research, especially Eric Montgomery, Matt Walsh, and Justin Tombs. I was also fortunate enough to have this research funded by the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada. I am grateful to all of the above.

But the greatest debt of gratitude is owed to those whom I cherish most. It is they who are most directly impacted by my studies: my daughters, Ella and Aimee, and, especially, Robin, my wife. She has been tireless, patient, and loving, a support in so many ways. This is for you.

Abbreviations and Translations

Abbreviations

Abbreviations follow *The SBL Handbook of Style: For Biblical Studies and Related Disciplines*. 2nd ed. Atlanta: SBL Press, 2014.

Translations

Unless otherwise noted, I have followed the translation in the *Discoveries in the Judaean Desert* XL for the Hodayot and *The Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition* for the remainder of the Scrolls (with occasional minor alterations to each), though column and line numbers usually follow DJD where these differ. Quotations from the Hebrew Bible, Apocrypha, and New Testament are drawn from the *New Revised Standard Version* (with occasional minor alterations), unless otherwise noted. Quotations from the Pseudepigrapha are taken from Charlesworth's *Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*, unless otherwise noted. Citations from Philo and Josephus are drawn from the *Loeb Classical Library*.

Introduction

Long before nature made reason rave and threw it into the transcendental illusion, the contradiction felt between the destination of man, projected in the image of primordial innocence and final perfection, and the actual situation of man, acknowledged and confessed, gave rise to a gigantic “Why?” at the center of the experience of existing.

PAUL RICOEUR¹



The Questions

This study asks how the transition from the good beginning in Gen 1 to its disruptive ending in Gen 3 is understood in two corpora of Second Temple Jewish writings, the Sectarian Psalms of Qumran—primarily, the *Hodayot*—and the letters of Paul. What kind of break does this disruption entail—from God’s verdict that it was good, to the sentence of death? At the centre of the investigation is that formation from dust into which God exhales the breath of life. The whole narrative hinges on how this one, who becomes two, responds to God’s command. What accounts for their disobedience, and why is their end-fate so different from the beginning, to be blown upon, not by divine breath, but by the wind that rushes through trees and tears up the dust of the earth?

A typology of myths of the beginning of evil developed by Paul Ricoeur provides a useful springboard to begin to think about these issues. He speaks first of “the drama of creation,” in which “the origin of evil is coextensive with the origin of things; it is the ‘*chaos*’ with which the creative act of the god struggles.” A change in type is represented “with the idea of a ‘fall’ of man that arises as an irrational event in a *creation already completed*.” Intermediate to the drama of creation and the fall of man is the “tragic” type of “the god who tempts, blinds,

¹ *The Symbolism of Evil* (New York: Beacon Press, 1969), 165.

leads astray.”² These types are abstractions, and Ricoeur stresses the need to go beyond the attempt at classification toward a “dynamics that has as its task the discovery of the latent life of the myths and the play of their secret affinities.” He speaks, for instance, of the “secret affinities of the Biblical myth” carrying it “toward the myth of chaos and the tragic myth,”³ and he severely qualifies the language of “fall,” lamenting speculations that “tend to make Adam superior and hence a stranger to our condition.”⁴

It has been widely assumed that the Hodayot and, especially, the letters of Paul interpret the biblical witness as a straightforward example of the second type, the fall of man. This study questions in what way and to what extent that is true. In part, it seeks to uncover the “secret affinities” that the Hodayot and the Apostle Paul find and exploit in the biblical narratives of Adam and Eve’s creation and disobedience.

After each analysis of the Hodayot and Paul, I will summarize the results as answers to three questions:

What is the purpose and destiny of humankind as relayed in association with traditions of creation?

How is human creatureliness evaluated from the perspective of this purpose; is humanity innately equipped to fulfill it?

What means are provided within the mythology of creation to comprehend negative evaluations of human creatureliness?

The Comparison, Its Rationale

This study is concerned with the use of traditions of the origin of humankind (“anthropogony”) in the theological anthropology of the Qumran Hodayot and the letters of Paul. The similarities between these two corpora in terms of

2 A fourth type Ricoeur regarded as “marginal” to the preceding triad: “the myth of the exiled soul’ . . . divides man into *soul* and *body* and concentrates on the destiny of the soul, which it depicts as coming from elsewhere and straying here below, while the cosmogonic, or theogonic, background of the other myths receives little emphasis.” Ibid., 174.

3 Ibid., 171–74, some emphasis has been removed; among those “secret affinities” is the presence of the serpent in the garden (cf. p. 311), in connection with which Ricoeur speaks of evil as “already there” (p. 258). Cf. also, idem, “Evil,” ed. Lindsay Jones, *The Encyclopedia of Religion* (Detroit: Macmillan, 2005), 5:199–208.

4 Ricoeur, *The Symbolism of Evil*, 233.

the pessimistic account given of human nature and the prioritizing of divine agency in making right the sinner is well-documented, from the early period of research⁵ into several more recent studies.⁶ The most significant challenge to this comparison was made by E. P. Sanders, who with the pressure of a harmonizing reading of the major Qumran documents reduced the radical statements concerning humanity in the Hodayot to a function of their genre and of

-
- 5 Cf., e.g., Karl G. Kuhn, "Peirasmos-hamartia-sarx im Neuen Testament und die damit zusammenhängenden Vorstellungen," *ZTK* 49 (1952): 200–22; reprinted in idem, "New Light on Temptation, Sin, and Flesh in the New Testament," in *The Scrolls and the New Testament*, ed. Krister Stendahl (Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 1957), 94–113; Armin Dietzel, "Beten im Geist: eine religionsgeschichtliche Parallele aus den Hodayot zum paulinischen Gebet im Geist," *TZ* 13 (1957): 12–32; Siegfried Schulz, "Zur Rechtfertigung aus Gnaden im Qumran und bei Paulus: Zugleich ein Beitrag zur Form- und Überlieferungsgeschichte der Qumrantexte," *ZTK* 56 (1959): 155–85; Herbert Braun, "Römer 7,7–25 und das Selbstverständnis des Qumran-Frommen," *ZTK* 56 (1959): 1–18; Walter Grundmann, "Der Lehrer der Gerechtigkeit von Qumran und die Frage nach der Glaubensgerechtigkeit in der Theologie des Apostels Paulus," *RevQ* 6 (1960): 237–59; reprinted in idem, "The Teacher of Righteousness of Qumran and the Question of Justification by Faith in the Theology of the Apostle Paul," in *Paul and Qumran*, ed. Jerome Murphy-O'Connor (London: Geoffrey Chapman, 1968), 85–114; Jürgen Becker, *Das Heil Gottes: Heils- und Sündenbegriffe in Qumran und im Neuen Testament*, SUNT 3 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1964); Heinz-Wolfgang Kuhn, *Enderwartung und gegenwärtiges Heil*, SUNT 4 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1966).
- 6 Cf., e.g., John M. G. Barclay, *Paul and the Gift* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2015), 239–40: "The Qumran hymns thus place divine grace and human worth in the starkest possible contrast . . . , and in this regard they create a polarity more extreme than can be found in any Second Temple text other than the letters of Paul"; also Jason Maston, *Divine and Human Agency in Second Temple Judaism: A Comparative Study*, WUNT 297 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2010); Stephen Westerholm, "Paul's Anthropological 'Pessimism' in Its Jewish Context," in *Divine and Human Agency in Paul and His Cultural Environment*, ed. John M. G. Barclay and Simon J. Gathercole (London: T & T Clark, 2008), 71–98; Stephen J. Hultgren, *From the Damascus Covenant to the Covenant of the Community: Literary, Historical, and Theological Studies in the Dead Sea Scrolls*, STDJ 66 (Leiden: Brill, 2007); Emanuela Zurlì, *La giustificazione "solo per grazia" negli scritti di Qumran: Analisi dell'innò finale della Regola della comunità e degli Inni* (Napoli: Chirico, 2003); idem, "La giustificazione 'solo per grazia' in 1QS x,9–xi e 1QH^a," *RevQ* 79 (2002): 445–77; Jörg Frey, "Flesh and Spirit in the Palestinian Jewish Sapiential Tradition and in the Qumran Texts: An Inquiry into the Background of Pauline Usage," in *The Wisdom Texts from Qumran and the Development of Sapiential Thought*, ed. Charlotte Hempel, Armin Lange, and Hermann Lichtenberger, BETL 159 (Leuven: Peeters, 2002), 367–404; idem, "The Notion of 'Flesh' in 4QInstruction and the Background of Pauline Usage," in *Sapiential, Liturgical and Poetical Texts from Qumran*, ed. F. García Martínez, STDJ 35 (Leiden: Brill, 2000), 197–226; idem, "Die paulinische Antithese von 'Fleisch' und 'Geist' und die palästinisch-jüdische Weisheitstradition," *ZNW* 90 (1999): 45–77.

the rhetorical effect of magnifying God.⁷ More than one reason will be found to question this sort of argument,⁸ but the concern of this present study is less to reconstruct and compare the anthropologies and systems of salvation in these corpora than it is to compare the theological framework which best accounts for, or emerges from, their use of traditions of anthropogony: what do they do with traditions of anthropogony and what theological and hermeneutical factors appear to be at play? For the most part, I will let their particular theological anthropologies speak for themselves, but the effect will be to confirm the substantial agreement between them.

The insight that such a scriptural-hermeneutical perspective might form the basis of a fruitful comparison of the Hodayot and the letters of Paul emerged with the realization that both construct their negative anthropologies in large part through motifs drawn from narratives or traditions of the creation of humankind. This is widely accepted in the case of Paul, even if the dominant paradigm within which this has been grasped has been fall and restoration. In the Hodayot, many saw the importance of creation traditions for the construction of a pessimistic anthropology before Sanders, and then Hermann Lichtenberger sealed the case in his 1975/80 dissertation, arguing that “die

7 E. P. Sanders, *Paul and Palestinian Judaism: A Comparison of Patterns of Religion* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1977), 287–98; he was drawing on the observations of Hans Bardtke, “Considérations sur les cantiques de Qumrân,” *RB* 63 (1956): 220–33. Sanders stood in the tradition of several scholars who had sounded reservations and lodged qualifications especially to K. G. Kuhn’s overstatement of the flesh/spirit antithesis in the Hodayot and 1QS, but in general he took their arguments far further by denying that there was anything unusual in the anthropology of these texts; cf. W. D. Davies, “Paul and the Dead Sea Scrolls: Flesh and Spirit,” in *The Scrolls and the New Testament*, ed. Krister Stendahl, repr. (New York: Crossroad, 1992), 157–82; Hans Walter Huppenbauer, “Bśr ‘Fleisch’ in den Texten von Qumran (Höhle 1),” *TZ* 13 (1957): 298–300; Roland E. Murphy, “Bśr in the Qumran Literature and Sarks in the Epistle to the Romans,” in *Sacra Pagina: Miscellanea Biblica Congressus Internationalis Catholici de Re Biblica*, ed. Joseph Coppens, A. Descamps, and E. Massaux (Gembloux: J. Duculot, 1959), 60–76; Hans Hübner, “Anthropologischer Dualismus in den Hodayoth?” *NTS* 18 (1972): 268–84.

8 For a rebuttal: Maston, *Agency*, 80. For the adoption of Sanders’ argument: Preston M. Sprinkle, *Paul and Judaism Revisited: A Study of Divine and Human Agency in Salvation* (Downers Grove, IL: IVP Academic Press, 2013), 87–88; and to a greater extreme than even Sanders: Chris VanLandingham, *Judgment and Justification in Early Judaism and the Apostle Paul* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2006), 122, 132–35. For a recent discussion of the portrayal of sin in the Hodayot within the context of the genre of prayer and in comparison to other genres, cf. Miryam T. Brand, *Evil Within and Without: The Source of Sin and Its Nature as Portrayed in Second Temple Literature*, *Journal of Ancient Judaism. Supplements* 9 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2013), 59–73.

Frage, wie die Sünde in die Welt gekommen ist, wird nicht mit Sünden- oder Engelfall beantwortet; Sünde beruht auf der Kreatürlichkeit des Menschen.”⁹ Indeed, the startling aspect of the Hodayot’s use of creation traditions is the manner in which they undercut any potency of a doctrine of the fall by the way they get behind any contingencies introduced by human behaviour and describe all kinds of corruption as innate in the very created nature of the human being. In this way, “the self enacts its own nothingness,” in the words of Carol Newsom.¹⁰ While other ancient Jewish authors might be drawn upon to illustrate such a negative application of the creation traditions, the degree of overlap in the anthropological pessimism and prioritization of divine grace between these corpora suggests that the comparison might be especially fruitful if undertaken between them.

However, a negative conception of the human being is only one side of the coin in the Hodayot and the letters of Paul. Both corpora contain fantastic anticipations of human destiny which are set in direct relief to the dark hues with which traditions of creation are used to paint a forlorn view of the human being. And yet the exalted destiny of the (elect) human being is also coloured herein by traditions of anthropogony. How then these paradoxical uses of anthropogonic traditions are related to each other becomes a major question. That the Hodayot sustain an extraordinarily high view of human destiny while severely problematizing created human nature, in other words, doing so without a robust doctrine of the fall, gives us occasion to reconsider the framework within which Paul also uses anthropogonic traditions and to search out the rationale by which these traditions can be used to sustain (or generate) such complex anthropologies.

Although they share a related cultural space, the Hodayot do not depend upon Paul, and Paul, in all likelihood, does not depend upon the Hodayot. The juxtaposition of these corpora is heuristic, to assist us to ask new questions, perhaps answer old ones, and engender fresh insights. The remainder of this introduction therefore sets forth the most important issues of scholarly discussion to which this study is addressed.

9 Hermann Lichtenberger, *Studien zum Menschenbild in Texten der Qumrangemeinde*, SUNT 15 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1980), 90. For his particular contribution, cf. the discussion of *Niedrigkeitsdoxologie* in Chapter 2.

10 Carol A. Newsom, *The Self as Symbolic Space: Constructing Identity and Community at Qumran*, STDJ 52 (Leiden: Brill, 2004), 220. I describe Newsom’s important work more at various points in Chapter 2.

Issues of Anthropogony in the Hodayot

There are arguably two broad frameworks within which the origin of evil is comprehended in Second Temple Jewish literature. John Collins distinguishes these as apocalyptic and wisdom.¹¹ The paradigm text for the first is the Enochic myth of the fall of the watchers (cf. 1 En. 6–36), which comprehends evil in relation to the development of traditions of the mating of the sons of God with the daughters of men in Gen 6:1–7, and for the second, one may single out the sage Ben Sira (cf. 15:11–20; 17:1–24; 25:24; 33:10–13), who privileges the narratives of Adam and Eve's creation and disobedience in Gen 2–3. Typically, the scriptural matrix within which scholars have situated the Hodayot's infamous texts of anthropological abasement (e.g., 1QH^a v 30–33; 1X 23–25; XV 39–40) includes the J narratives of creation, particularly Gen 2–3, Ps 51, and the book of Job.¹² Ostensibly, this would situate the Hodayot within the wisdom trajectory. Many recent treatments of the thought of the Hodayot confirm this setting,¹³ and studies related to the proliferation and development of wisdom tradition, including within the Hodayot, suggest the plausibility of this framework.¹⁴ However, Enochic elements are also to the fore in much of the Qumran literature, and several scholars have recently emphasized their presence in the Hodayot (cf., e.g., 1QH^a XI 6–30; XII 30–41).¹⁵ Stephen Hultgren, in particular,

-
- 11 John J. Collins, *Apocalypticism in the Dead Sea Scrolls* (London: Routledge, 1997), 30–36. For a wide ranging survey, cf. also Brand, *Evil Within and Without*.
 - 12 Cf., e.g., Lichtenberger, *Menschenbild*, 183; James Philip Hyatt, "View of Man in the Qumran 'Hodayot,'" *NTS* 2 (1956): 284.
 - 13 Shane Berg, "Religious Epistemologies in the Dead Sea Scrolls: The Heritage and Transformation of the Wisdom Tradition" (PhD diss., Yale University, 2009), 156–99; Matthew J. Goff, "Reading Wisdom at Qumran: 4QInstruction and the Hodayot," *DSD* 11 (2004): 263–88.
 - 14 Cf., e.g., Sarah Jean Tanzer, "The Sages at Qumran: Wisdom in the Hodayot" (PhD diss., Harvard University, 1987); Armin Lange, "Wisdom and Predestination in the Dead Sea Scrolls," *DSD* 2 (1995): 340–54; idem, *Weisheit und Prädestination: weisheitliche Urordnung und Prädestination in den Textfunden von Qumran*, STDJ 18 (Leiden: Brill, 1995).
 - 15 Angela Kim Harkins, *Reading With an "I" to the Heavens: Looking at the Qumran Hodayot Through the Lens of Visionary Traditions*, Ekstasis 3 (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2012); cf. the programmatic statement on p. 17; eadem, "The Performative Reading of the Hodayot: The Arousal of Emotions and the Exegetical Generation of Texts," *JSP* 21 (2011): 55–71; eadem, "Reading the Qumran Hodayot in the Light of Traditions Associated with Enoch," *Hen* 32 (2010): 1–42; George W. E. Nickelsburg, "The Qumranic Radicalizing and Anthropologizing of an Eschatological Tradition (1QH 4:29–40)," in *Ernten, was man sät: Festschrift für Klaus Koch zu seinem 65 Geburtstag*, ed. D. R. Daniels, U. Glessmer, and M. Rösel (Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1991), 423–35; reprinted as idem, "The

has suggested that the most severe traditions of anthropological abasement, those which tie impurity and sin to creatureliness (e.g., 1QH^a v 32; IX 24; XX 27–28), might be informed by the Enochic myth rather than the creation of Adam and Eve.¹⁶ The issue is of decisive importance for this undertaking. This study finds that the Hodayot are indeed influenced by the watchers mythology but that they have contracted all subsequent developments of human erring and failing into the creation of humankind *per se*, partly under the pressure of a heightened sense of divine sovereignty.

Related to this question is the matter of purity and sin. Scholars such as Jonathan Klawans and Hannah Harrington have argued that biblical distinctions between ritual and moral impurity break down in the DSS. Klawans even quips, “what is evil is impure, what is impure is demonic.”¹⁷ Harrington is a bit more cautious, but she asserts concerning the Hodayot that the author “describes the human being as hopelessly depraved and inherently impure.”¹⁸ Hultgren, we have seen, wants to push the negative significance of this category away from creation to the impure spirits that affect humankind since the *nephilim* were wiped out in the flood. William Loader cautions that human sexuality (a major source of impurity) is not in fact an object of loathing.¹⁹ This study concludes the opposite of these two qualifications, that human sexuality is indeed fundamentally problematic in the Hodayot, and that the roots of this problem are in Adam’s creation from dust. The specific scriptural and conceptual warrants for these claims will also be spelled out.

The negative anthropology of the Hodayot crystalizes in what H.-W. Kuhn termed the *Niedrigkeitsdoxologien*.²⁰ The form-critical antecedents of these

Qumranic Transformation of a Cosmological and Eschatological Tradition (1QH 4:29–40),” in *Madrid Qumran Congress: Proceedings of the International Congress on the Dead Sea Scrolls, Madrid, 18–21 March 1991*, ed. J. C. Trebolle Barrera and L. Vegas Montaner, vol. 2, STDJ 11 (Leiden: Brill, 1992), 649–59.

16 Hultgren, *Covenant*, 436–37.

17 The statement continues “... and foreigners are impure.” Jonathan Klawans, *Impurity and Sin in Ancient Judaism* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000), 88.

18 Hannah K. Harrington, *The Purity Texts*, Companion to the Qumran Scrolls (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 2004), 56–57.

19 William R. G. Loader, *The Dead Sea Scrolls on Sexuality: Attitudes towards Sexuality in Sectarian and Related Literature at Qumran* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2009), 251–54, 383–88. Contrast also Paul Heger, “Celibacy in Qumran—Hellenistic Fiction or Reality? Qumran’s Attitude toward Sex,” *RevQ* 26 (2013): 53–90.

20 On details of the form, cf. Kuhn, *Enderwartung*, 26–29.

“chains of self-abuse”²¹ were initially identified by J. Becker as the Hebrew Bible’s *Gerichtsdoxologien*.²² However, I situate these texts primarily in the widely attested category “self abasement” and “insult formula,” specifically, what I call “anthropological interrogatives,” which are derived in the Hodayot primarily from Job, and in there from the eighth Psalm. In fact, the importance of book of Job for the Hodayot is being noticed by others,²³ but the argument in the following pages suggests that the full extent of this influence has yet to be noticed. This study finds that Joban traditions are a major influence upon the Hodayot’s negative construction of human creatureliness from Gen 2–3.

It is well known that the Hodayot are characterized not only by the “pathological abhorrence of human nature” but also by the celebration of an extraordinarily exalted destiny: “By joining the sect our author becomes somehow a citizen of heaven, an almost superhuman being.”²⁴ Angela Kim Harkins and Eric Miller have argued that the motif of heavenly exaltation should be comprehended within the Enochic tradition (cf. 1QH^a XI 6–30; XXV 34–XXVI 9).²⁵ Crispin Fletcher-Louis has made the case that heavenly exaltation reflects an implicit belief in the angelo-morphic or divine anthropology of humankind, the conviction that original humanity enjoys “ontological affinity” with God, that it “embod[ied] God’s glory.”²⁶ He points to Gen 1:26–27 as providing the foundation for this conception. However, explicit links and traditional precedents for understanding this exalted destiny as an anthropological category within the Hodayot might still be more clearly identified. This study seeks to make such an identification with the aid of 4QInstruction and the Treatise on

21 I am adapting a phrase from J. Licht, “The Doctrine of the Thanksgiving Scroll,” *IEJ* 6 (1956): 10–11.

22 Becker, *Das Heil Gottes*, 135–36.

23 Especially Berg, “Religious Epistemologies,” 164–72; also Carol A. Newsom, “Models of the Moral Self: Hebrew Bible and Second Temple Judaism,” *JBL* 131 (2012): 23–24.

24 Licht, “Doctrine,” 11, 101. Note the word “almost”: according to Licht, the author “does not claim to have become a member, so to speak, of the angelic choir, or to enjoy personally the company of these exalted beings; he is no mystic. The companionship of the angels is claimed *through* membership of the sect. . . . It is thus a choir parallel, so to speak, with the choirs in heaven” (101).

25 Harkins, *Reading with an “I,”* 17; eadem, “A New Proposal for Thinking about 1QH^a Sixty Years after Its Discovery,” in *Qumran Cave 1 Revisited: Texts from Cave 1 Sixty Years After Their Discovery: Proceedings of the Sixth Meeting of the 10QS in Ljubljana*, ed. Sarianna Metso, Donald W. Parry, and Eibert J. C. Tigchelaar, *STDJ* 91 (Leiden: Brill, 2010), 111–12; Eric Miller, “The Self-Glorification Hymn Reexamined,” *Hen* 31 (2009): 307–24.

26 Crispin H. T. Fletcher-Louis, *All the Glory of Adam: Liturgical Anthropology in the Dead Sea Scrolls*, *STDJ* 42 (Leiden: Brill, 2002), 94, 97.

the Two Spirits (1QS III 13–IV 26), which are widely thought to stand in the same tradition, perhaps even to have influenced the Hodayot.²⁷ I complete the study of the Hodayot with the depiction of an exalted figure *par excellence*, the so-called “Self-Glorification Psalm,” arguing on the basis of traditions of anthropogony that it expresses the fulfillment of the original intended destiny of humankind. At the same time, this study finds that the anthropology of the Hodayot is significantly more conflicted than Fletcher-Louis allows and that motifs of deification operate within an implied framework of the duality of heaven and earth and graded notions of divinity.

Finally, the contextualization of the Hodayot’s exalted depiction of elect humankind as an anthropological category, an enjoyment of “all the glory of *adam*” (1QH^a IV 27), raises an issue at the heart of this study. How can the Hodayot tie a profoundly negative view of human creatureliness directly to the conditions established in creation and at the same time draw upon anthropogonic traditions to depict the exalted destiny of elect humankind? Fletcher-Louis has what might be characterized as a two-pronged approach: he argues for the concept of the restoration of Adam’s lost glory and undermines the extent to which human ontology is problematic, for the Adam created from dust has not yet entered the garden of glory: “the movement within the *Hodayot* from the status of a creature of dust and clay to the exalted position of the pre-lapsarian Adam in the Eden of Glory is a movement from outside to inside the cult and the community it circumscribes.”²⁸ In contrast, Harkins observes

27 On this relationship, cf. Jean-Sébastien Rey, *4QInstruction: sagesse et eschatologie*, STDJ 81 (Leiden: Brill, 2009), 22–28; Goff, “Reading Wisdom”; Eibert J. C. Tigchelaar, *To Increase Learning for the Understanding Ones: Reading and Reconstructing the Fragmentary Early Jewish Sapiential Text 4QInstruction*, WUNT 44 (Leiden: Brill, 2001), 194–207.

28 Fletcher-Louis, *All the Glory*, 108 (emphasis original). He adds that much cultic language has been overlooked in the Hodayot (e.g., in XI 20–24), and then suggests that “the tension between the exalted and a transformed identity on the one hand and the earthly, fleshly creature of clay on the other . . . is a matter of . . . different modes, times and places within the liturgical and cultic world.” Ibid., 112. Eileen Schuller has pointed to possible liturgical features in some Cave 4 copies: “Some Reflections on the Function and Use of Poetical Texts among the Dead Sea Scrolls,” in *Liturgical Perspectives: Prayer and Poetry in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls: Proceedings of the Fifth International Symposium of the Orion Center for the Study of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Associated Literature, 19–23 January, 2000*, ed. Esther G. Chazon, STDJ 48 (Leiden: Brill, 2003), 178–79. The liturgical interests of the Hodayot are now also stressed in different ways by Harkins, “A New Proposal” and Esther Chazon, “Liturgical Function in the Cave 1 Hodayot Collection,” in *Qumran Cave 1 Revisited: Texts from Cave 1 Sixty Years after Their Discovery: Proceedings of the Sixth Meeting of the IOQS in Ljubljana*, ed. Sarianna Metso, Donald W. Parry, and Eibert J. C. Tigchelaar, STDJ 91 (Leiden: Brill, 2010), 135–52.

that the speaker is confounded by his own humanity in response to celestial experience (comparing Isa 6:1–7).²⁹ She suggests that this otherworldly context is an important feature of *Niedrigkeitsdoxologien* in general.³⁰ Jason Maston insists that the psalmists read Gen 2:7 through the lens of 3:19, so as to “maintain that the very material used to create Adam is the ultimate cause of his failure.”³¹ Yet Maston, too, accepts that the Hodayot are largely “a reflection on how God redeems sinners from themselves and restores to them the glory once held by Adam.”³² Two points of nuance and caution will be added to this discussion: the abasement of Adamic ontology in the Hodayot ought to warn against reading an uncomplicated framework of fall-restoration (or ontological affinity) into their employment of anthropogonic traditions; similarly, caution is also warranted about the manner that the glory of *adam* is interpreted, since the clearest accounts of Adam’s glory as a supernatural property of his date at the earliest to the first century CE.³³ It cannot be assumed that

29 Harkins, “Reading the Qumran Hodayot,” 40; cf., also, eadem, “A New Proposal,” 111–12.

30 Harkins, “A New Proposal,” 111–22. Philip S. Alexander also comments that “the texts are filled with a sense of unworthiness, of the continuing burden imposed upon the mystic by the world, the flesh and the devil. The final transformation will only be achieved at the *eschaton*, but it clearly can be anticipated in moments of ecstasy now”; “Qumran and the Genealogy of Western Mysticism,” in *New Perspectives on Old Texts: Proceedings of the Tenth International Symposium of the Orion Center for the Study of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Associated Literature, 9–11 January, 2005*, ed. Esther G. Chazon, Betsy Halpern Amaru, and Ruth Clements, STDJ 88 (Leiden: Brill, 2010), 224; cf., also, idem, *Mystical Texts*, ECDSS (London: T & T Clark, 2006), 74. Esther Chazon juxtaposes liturgical traditions of penitential prayer and praying with the angels with a similar effect in “Lowly to Lofty: The Hodayot’s Use of Liturgical Traditions to Shape Sectarian Identity and Religious Experience,” *RevQ* 26 (2013): 3–19.

31 Maston, *Agency*, 93.

32 Ibid., 81.

33 Cf. the conclusions of John Levison: “There is remarkably little speculation about the original nature of Adam in the authors of Early Judaism which we examined”; *Portraits of Adam in Early Judaism: From Sirach to 2 Baruch* (Sheffield: JSOT, 1988), 152–54. Jubilees, for example, is restrained about Adam and Eve’s original condition and stresses rather the extraordinary nature of Eden itself (cf. 2:7; 3:9–31); we shall see the same for the glory of *adam* traditions in the DSS. The clearest expressions of Adam’s original condition being characterized by supernatural glory, outside of the Rabbinic corpus (e.g., Gen. Rab. 21), occur in the Life of Adam and Eve (cf., e.g., Apoc. Mos. 20:1–2; 21:1–6) and (with less clarity) 2 En. 30:10–11. Neither text can be dated with confidence any earlier than the first century CE and both are often dated a good deal later than that. Sirach 49:16 provides rather slender evidence. See now, too, the overview in Grant R. Macaskill, *Union with Christ in the New Testament* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013), 128–43.

where certain amenable presuppositions are already in place so too is the fully formed tradition. Traditions develop, evolve, and one must take care not to mistake Cro-Magnon for modern man.³⁴ Instead, a more thoroughgoing reading of the Hodayot in the mythological framework of the Treatise on the Two Spirits will be advanced.

Issues of Anthropogony in Paul

Pauline scholars, as a group, do not seem to know what to do with anthropogonic traditions in Paul, or to use a potentially misleading simplification, his “Adam references.” Many scholars appeal to categories of fall and restoration, sometimes while admitting their inadequacy; others—though they rarely succeed in letting them go—assert that such categories are unhelpful and that Adam is basically an empty container in Paul, serving to supply whatever negative content is needed to put salvation in Christ into relief. The confusion that persists is still well illustrated by an article published in 1979 by John Ziesler. The article is noteworthy not because it has been particularly influential but because it is typical of the struggle just described and also because Ziesler almost happens upon an alternative framework that might have aided in providing a more coherent account of anthropogony in Paul.

“Anthropology of hope” is the term Ziesler lends to what he sees as the Pauline focus on the Last, rather than the First, Adam as “the definitive man.”³⁵ Ziesler argues that “Paul’s view of man is directed so firmly to the Last Adam and to the goal of man that he has no doctrine of the ‘fall’—or, to be more circumspect,” he adds, “that notions of a fall and a restoration perform no function in his theology.”³⁶ In contrast then to (later) Jewish traditions that focused on a glorious Adam and Christian, especially “Augustinian,” traditions that highlighted a fall from righteousness, Ziesler correlates Paul rather with an Irenaean type of soteriology that stressed Adam’s immaturity or incompleteness. However, the identification can only be partial, claims Ziesler, inasmuch as Paul “never discusses man’s original state,” but instead looks ahead (to

34 I hesitate to use the analogy lest I be thought to degrade the early stages of the tradition. I intend no evaluation of the worth of these traditions, nor would I insult Cro-Magnon Man (to his face).

35 John A. Ziesler, “Anthropology of Hope,” *ExpT* 90 (1979): 108.

36 *Ibid.*, 105.

Christ) rather than back (to Adam) for “the true definition of humanity.”³⁷ It is illuminating how quickly Ziesler reverts to the idea of the fall, even though he wants to debunk the three stage framework, creation-fall-restoration.³⁸ Ziesler, for instance, permits himself to “disregard” the plain meaning of 1 Cor 11:7 (“man is the image and glory of God”), which, he says, “*oddly uses* [Gen 1:26–27] *as if there had been no fall*.” The justification given for dismissing this statement is that it does not occur in a “soteriological context.”³⁹

Ziesler is not alone in struggling with Paul’s Adam statements. In his important study, *The Last Adam*, Robin Scroggs argues that “whereas [Paul’s] contemporaries tend to contrast the past (the first Adam) with the present, Paul uses only a contrast of the present with the future (the Last Adam).”⁴⁰ This is because “Adam” is said to be a largely negative figure in Paul, who defines the present “fallen” condition of humanity; true humanity is revealed not in Adam but in Christ.⁴¹ But Scroggs fails to paint a consistent picture. He reasons that “since the world to come is a new *creation*, it is apparent that Paul has accepted the *Urzeit-Endzeit* formulation so characteristic of the Judaism of his day.”⁴² This guards against the suggestion “that God’s intention at creation was inferior . . . [which] would have foundered on the notion of God’s mercy and grace.”⁴³ When commenting on Rom 8:20, he says, “The original paradise has disappeared and the world doomed to corruption and decay.”⁴⁴ But this idea of original perfection does not sit well with other features of Paul’s thought as described by Scroggs: “Nowhere in the Epistles is Adam the perfect

37 Ibid., 106. For research on the history of these doctrines in the early church, cf. Rowan A. Greer, “Sinned We All in Adam’s Fall,” in *The Social World of the First Christians: Essays in Honour of Wayne A. Meeks*, ed. L. Michael White and O. Larry Yarbrough (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1995), 382–94; Norman Powell Williams, *The Ideas of the Fall and of Original Sin: A Historical and Critical Study* (London: Longmans, Green, 1927); F. R. Tennant, *The Sources of the Doctrines of the Fall and Original Sin* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1903).

38 Ziesler, “Anthropology of Hope,” 106–7.

39 Ibid., 107. Emphasis added.

40 Robin Scroggs, *The Last Adam: A Study in Pauline Anthropology* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1966), 60.

41 “The unique features of Paul’s Adamic Christology then lies precisely in the shift of these important theological functions [i.e., defining true humanity] from the first Adam to the Last” (91). Scroggs signals his agreement with Karl Barth, *Christ and Adam: Man and Humanity in Romans 5* (New York: Harper & Bros, 1957); cf. the rejoinder to Barth’s exegesis in Rudolf Bultmann, “Adam und Christus nach Rom 5,” *ZNW* 50 (1959): 145–65.

42 Scroggs, *The Last Adam*, 62.

43 Ibid.

44 Ibid., 91.

man before his sin. Paul knows only the Adam of sin and death.”⁴⁵ Likewise, “curiously enough, Paul never says that Adam caused the loss of the glory and image which God intended for man, although he clearly knows man now lacks these.”⁴⁶ And, yet commenting on Rom 3:23: “As a result of sin man no longer possesses that glory which he had in the beginning.”⁴⁷ The discussion of death and resurrection in 1 Cor 15:45–50, where the creation of Adam is in view, is made to cohere with “Paul’s basic affirmation” of Rom 5:12;⁴⁸ hence, later Scroggs imports Adam’s “fall” into 1 Cor 15, stating, “To bear the image of the man of dust means to exist in the same nature as the fallen Adam.”⁴⁹ Paul’s statement that “man is the image and glory of God” (1 Cor 11:7) is attributed to a “lapse” in thinking—somehow Paul temporarily gives up the view that “man” no longer possesses these qualities as a result of the fall.⁵⁰

The inconsistency of Ziesler and Scroggs illustrates the need to thoroughly rethink Paul’s Adam references as well as to seek out alternative presuppositions which might lie beneath them. Clearly, neither alternative of creation-fall-restoration nor a limited interest in Adam-the-villain in favour of Christ-the-true-man accounts very well for the number and diversity of Paul’s statements. This study seeks out other presuppositions, other ways that Paul might have read Gen 1–3 and employed creation traditions in order to attempt to give a more thoroughly coherent account of anthropogony in his letters. Almost by accident, this study finds that Paul’s thought shares more with the Irenaean framework than Ziesler could see and that such a framework, or something similar to it, offers a viable alternative to the reigning paradigms.

Scholars have begun to emphasize the inter-connected destinies and ontologies of Adam and creation. In his classic work, *From First Adam to Last*, C. K. Barrett signalled his agreement with the likes of Ernst Käsemann in emphasizing the essential “cosmological” or “apocalyptic-mythical” elements of Paul’s thought in addition to the anthropological. Barrett argues that Adam gives up the vocation to exercise dominion over creation and rather becomes himself subject to hostile powers (Rom 8:38–39; Gal 4:3, 9; 2 Thess 2:1–12; Col 1:16, 20; 2:15) of a perverted creation (Rom 8:19–21).⁵¹ At present, then,

45 Ibid., 100.

46 Ibid., 90–91.

47 Ibid., 73.

48 Ibid., 73.

49 Ibid., 89.

50 Ibid., 70 n. 3.

51 C. K. Barrett, *From First Adam to Last: A Study in Pauline Theology* (London: Black, 1962), 9–15.

creation, being fallen, does not reveal God's true intention, which can only be known in the Heavenly Man and the process of redemption.⁵² Christ, therefore, must reclaim "the dominion promised to man in creation" (Rom 5:12ff.; Phil 2:5–11).⁵³ This study argues that the interconnected ontologies of Adam and creation militate against the concept of an originally completed creation which was for a time subject to Adam. Moreover, the typical "apocalyptic" emphasis on the ruination of creation will be severely qualified inasmuch as Paul is found on several occasions to make positive theological use of the present state of creation.⁵⁴ Paul seems able to think of creation as a material reality in distinction to creation under the aspect of a negative spiritual-moral influence and this goes some way toward accounting for the different emphases in the use of Adam-traditions between Galatians, the Corinthian letters, and Philippians, on the one hand, and the letter to the Romans, on the other.

Paul's use of the category of creation is intimately connected with that of the image of God. We have already seen Ziesler and Scroggs struggle with Paul's positive application of the concept to present humanity. Scholars' ubiquitous use of the language of the image of God being lost or defaced apparently reflects the assumption that if the believer is being conformed to the image of Christ, then the original image of God must be lost or tarnished.⁵⁵ The problem stems from conceiving of the image of God strictly as an anthropological category.⁵⁶ Gordon Fee represents many others at present when he argues with no shortage of conviction that the original *adamic* image of God

52 Ibid., 83–88.

53 Ibid., 16, cf. 68–87.

54 N. T. Wright likewise emphasizes the interrelated destinies of Adam and creation, but he puts a familiar twist on them, asserting that "speculation about Adam, in the intertestamental and rabbinic literature in particular . . . is not about 'humankind in general.' It is about Israel, the people of God"; *The Climax of the Covenant: Christ and the Law in Pauline Theology* (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1991), 20. In this light, "Paul's Adam-christology is basically an Israel-christology, and is predicated on the identification of Jesus as Messiah, in virtue of his resurrection" (20). Wright's emphasis captures an important aspect of the Adam narratives, both in their canonical and Second Temple contexts, but the bald antithesis that "Adam theology" is "not about humankind in general" "but about Israel" will be shown to be a false dichotomy. This way of framing the issue sacrifices too much of the cosmological and anthropological elements of Paul's thought, which are reflected in his discussion of both the first and the last Adam.

55 Cf. Michael J. Gorman, *Inhabiting the Cruciform God: Kenosis, Justification, and Theosis in Paul's Narrative Soteriology* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2009), 36.

56 In contrast, e.g., to Jacob Jervell, *Imago Dei: Gen 1,26f im Spätjudentum, in der Gnosis und in den paulinischen Briefen*, FRLANT 76 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1960); Friedrich Wilhelm Eltester, *Eikon im Neuen Testament*, BZNW 23 (Berlin: A Töppelmann, 1958).

is restored in Christ, who in his humanity bore that image perfectly because he was also God.⁵⁷ James Dunn argues differently that Paul applies the term “image of God” exclusively to the *risen* and *exalted* Lord who in his heavenly state fulfills the vision predicated of humanity in Ps 8 (with Ps 110), and bears and restores the image and glory that Adam “lost” and “failed to reach.”⁵⁸ However, this study finds that a plain reading of 1 Cor 11:7, “man is the image and glory of God,” coheres readily, for instance, with 1 Cor 15:49, “we shall bear the image of the heavenly,” with the insight that Paul distinguishes between the earthly and the heavenly image, both of which he finds intimated in Gen 1:26–27. Scholars have also been vexed over the continuation of Paul’s statement in 1 Col 11:7—“... and woman is the glory of man”—which readily implies some unequal relationship between man and woman in relation to the image of God. However, the recognition of the predominately *somatic* character of Paul’s image language, recently also emphasized by Stephanie Lorenzen,⁵⁹ serves to make this implication coherent, and at the same time to show that 1 Cor 11:7 and 15:45–50 also serve to unlock the enigmatic statement that “in Christ” “there is no longer male and female” (Gal 3:28). This study argues that Paul does not imagine the restoration of the *adamic* image of God, for it was never lost and upon it he bases the inequality between the sexes; rather, he imagines its metamorphosis into the heavenly image of Christ.

Two final areas of contribution relate to the burgeoning interest in Paul’s participatory soteriology. The prevalence of Gen 1–3 and Ps 8 in Paul, texts which are explicitly involved in the negotiation of human identity relative to divinity, puts the present discussion in conversation with those who are exploring the category of participation as deification, divinization, or (apo)theosis.⁶⁰ Robin Scroggs may be taken as a negative example of the application of this category.

-
- 57 E.g., Gordon D. Fee, *Pauline Christology: An Exegetical-Theological Study* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 2007), 523. Fee followed Scroggs, *The Last Adam*. He is supported by Jonathan D. Worthington, *Creation in Paul and Philo: The Beginning and Before*, WUNT 317 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2011); Benjamin C. Blackwell, *Christosis: Pauline Soteriology in Light of Deification in Irenaeus and Cyril of Alexandria*, WUNT 314 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2011); Stefanie Lorenzen, *Das paulinische Eikon-Konzept: semantische Analysen zur Sapientia Salomonis, zu Philo und den Paulusbriefen*, WUNT 250 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008).
- 58 James D. G. Dunn, *Christology in the Making: A New Testament Inquiry into the Origins of the Doctrine of the Incarnation*, 2nd ed. (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1996), 108, 109.
- 59 Lorenzen, *Eikon-Konzept*, who strangely gives little attention to 1 Cor 11:7.
- 60 The importance of the Adam tradition for Paul’s participatory soteriology was highlighted by one of the early prominent proponents of this aspect of Paul’s letters, Morna Hooker; cf. the essays collected in eadem, *From Adam to Christ: Essays on Paul* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990). Proponents of deification or theosis often stress that

Commenting on 1 Cor 15:49, he writes, “The believer is identified specifically with the resurrected humanity of the Messiah. . . . This means . . . that no question can arise as to a possible deification of the believer through his eschatological existence, for the uniqueness of Christ as *kyrios* is nowhere compromised.”⁶¹ The strong bifurcation in the nature(s) of Christ in Scroggs’ account of Paul’s anthropological soteriology is related to the dubious affirmation that Jesus as εἰκὼν (in 1 Cor 15:49 as well as 2 Cor 3:18; 4:6) speaks specifically to his humanity. Ironically, Scroggs’ view concerning the image into which believers are transformed is not so different from two prominent *advocates* of theosis. Michael Gorman argues that Christ “truly and faithfully incarnated the image of God that Adam, by his disobedience, embodied unfaithfully and falsely.”⁶² Thus, with believers’ “participation in the divine *dikaioynē* and *doxa*,” Paul envisions a “new humanity” “on its way to being restored to the original glory for which it was created but that has been lost for a very long time.”⁶³ Ben C. Blackwell, commenting on 2 Cor 4:4 and 3:18, likewise interprets the “image of God” as referring to Christ’s humanity in which believers come to share. He thinks the *somatic* connotation of image supports this, as well as the use of imagery from Gen 1 in 2 Cor 4:4–6.⁶⁴ A similar interpretation is applied to 1 Cor 15:45–49.⁶⁵ However, the argument made in the present study that Paul conceives of the image of God on the model of heaven and earth and anticipates the consummation of the present Adamic image of God in the heavenly image of Christ buttresses David Litwa’s view that believers become the same image of the divine (not merely human) Christ.⁶⁶

Finally, this study has relevance for the discussion of the relationship between participatory and forensic categories in Paul’s thought. An investigation into Paul’s understanding of Gen 1–3 has the potential to shed light on the subject inasmuch as his thinking appears to be shaped by the relational and dynamic ontologies reflected in creation as well as by the appearance of the commandment in the Eden narrative. This represents a new approach to the discussion.

the concept offers a remedy to Ed Sanders’ confessed inability to contextualize Paul’s participatory language; cf. Sanders, *Paul and Palestinian Judaism*, 518–23.

61 Scroggs, *The Last Adam*, 88.

62 Gorman, *Inhabiting the Cruciform God*, 36.

63 Michael J. Gorman, “Romans: The First Christian Treatise on Theosis,” *JTI* 5 (2011): 15, 33.

64 Blackwell, *Christosis*, 193–97.

65 *Ibid.*, 216–19.

66 M. David Litwa, *We Are Being Transformed: Deification in Paul’s Soteriology*, BZNW 187 (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2012), 193–225; and, *idem*, “2 Corinthians 3:18 and Its Implications for Theosis,” *JTI* 2 (2008): 117–34.

Looking Forward

This investigation proceeds first with a study of anthropogonic traditions in the Hodayot, seeking to illuminate both its low and high anthropologies and the framework within which they are comprehended. It continues with three chapters on Paul. In the first I consider anthropogonic references outside Romans, in Galatians, 1–2 Corinthians, and Philippians, and then I continue with the somewhat different emphases of Paul's best known letter. I bring my conclusions on Paul into a separate chapter. Finally, I conclude the whole study, directly comparing the use of anthropogonic traditions in Paul and the Hodayot, and proceeding to offer directions for further research in relation to each.

Adam's Dust and Adam's Glory: Dichotomizing Anthropogonies in the Hodayot

In the Thanksgiving Psalms,¹ election to knowledge of divine things and to communion with heavenly beings collides with the earthly origin and the flesh and blood ontology of the human being. Paradoxically, however, both realities are expressed in the mythological idioms of the biblical creation traditions: God must overcome the creaturely condition of the one he created from the womb of the earth in order to bring to fulfillment the heavenly destiny God intends for the human being. I will argue that the paradox is not resolved by firmly distinguishing a pre- and post-lapsarian world,² but rather that the tension between human destiny and ontology is expressed as a feature inherent within divine creative will and operative from the moment of creation. This chapter will aim to show how scriptural traditions of creation, as found particularly in Genesis, Psalms, and Job, are taken up and transformed in the Sectarial Psalms' expression of this tension. The insights gleaned will then be applied to the so-called "Self-Glorification Psalm" in order to show that the claims made therein can be contextualized as anthropological motifs expressing the same mythological portraiture apparent elsewhere in the Hodayot.

Matters of Introduction and Method

The primary textual basis of this study are the Hodayot scrolls, including manuscripts of Cave 1 (1QH^{a,b})³ and Cave 4 (4QH^{a-f}/4Q427–432),⁴ as well as

- 1 There is no agreed upon standard to refer to this literature. I will generally adopt the terminology of "Thanksgiving Psalm(s)," "Hodayot," or "Sectarial Psalms" for the various collections, and typically "psalm" for individual compositions. Cf. the "note on terminology" in Eileen M. Schuller, "Recent Scholarship on the Hodayot 1993–2010," *CBR* 10 (2011): 121–22.
- 2 For the presence of this conceptuality in scholarship on the Hodayot, cf. n. 180. (Cross-references between footnotes are always within a chapter unless indicated otherwise.)
- 3 Hartmut Stegemann, Eileen M. Schuller, and Carol A. Newsom, eds., *Qumran Cave 1.III: 1QHodayota, with Incorporation of 1QHodayotb and 4QHodayota-F*, DJD XL (Oxford: Clarendon, 2008); Eleazar Lipa Sukenik, *The Dead Sea Scrolls of the Hebrew University* (Jerusalem: Magnes Press, 1955). For 1QH^b: D. Barthélemy and J. T. Milik, *Qumran Cave 1*, DJD I (Oxford: Clarendon, 1955).

4Q491 11,⁵ which preserves (a form of) the “Self-Glorification Psalm.” Very close in style and vocabulary to the Hodayot is the “*Maskil’s Psalm*” in the Community Rule (1QS x–xi; 4QS^b/4Q256 xix, xx; 4QS^d/4Q258 viii–x; 4QS^f/4Q260 ii–v; 4QS^j/4Q264), and close in didactic intent is The Two Spirits Treatise (1QS iii 13–iv 26; 4QS^c/4Q257 v).⁶

The Community Rule (1QS) and the Hodayot (1QH^a) are classic “sectarian” texts,⁷ probably composed no earlier than the mid-second century BCE.⁸ However, manuscript evidence published subsequent to the major Cave 1 copies demonstrates conclusively that both are composite documents, raising complex and still unanswered questions about their textual history. Consideration of the authorship of the Hodayot has undergone major shifts of opinion. From the early assumption of unity of authorship,⁹ including the contested attribution to the Teacher of Righteousness,¹⁰ to the distinction between Teacher and Community Psalms,¹¹ and the (sometimes) present dissatisfaction

4 Cf. E. Chazon et al., eds., *Qumran Cave 4.XX: Poetical and Liturgical Texts, Part 2*, DJD xxix (Oxford: Clarendon, 1999). Concerning 4Q431 frg. 1 (formerly 4Q471b), cf. the separate editions herein by E. Schuller (199–205) and E. Eshel (421–32).

5 M. Baillet, ed., *Qumrân Grotte 4.III (4Q482–4Q520)*, DJD vii (Oxford: Clarendon, 1982); Michael O. Wise, “מי כמוני באלים: A Study of 4Q491c, 4Q471b, 4Q427 7 and 1QH^a 25:35–26:10,” *DSD* 7 (2000): 178–93. (Wise’s reconstruction is followed here.)

6 Millar Burrows, ed., *The Dead Sea Scrolls of St. Mark’s Monastery* (New Haven, CT: The American Schools of Oriental Research, 1951); James H. Charlesworth, ed., *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Texts with English Translations. Volume 1, Rule of the Community and Related Documents*, PTS DSSP (Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 1994); Philip S. Alexander and Géza Vermès, eds., *Qumran Cave 4.XIX: 4QSerekh Ha-Yahad and Two Related Texts*, DJD xxvi (Oxford: Clarendon, 1998).

7 That is, texts originating from within the movement described as separating itself from the dominant politico-religious powers of the mid to late Second Temple Period in such texts as CD and 4QMMT and thought to be responsible for the collection of scrolls stored at Qumran. On the complications involved in the terminology “sectarian,” cf. Carol A. Newsom, “‘Sectually Explicit’ Literature from Qumran,” in *The Hebrew Bible and Its Interpreters*, ed. David N. Freedman, Baruch Halpern, and William H. Propp (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1990), 167–87.

8 The earliest manuscripts date to 100–50 BCE (4QH^b), for the Hodayot, and 125–100 BCE (4QS^a), for the Community Rule.

9 With commendable caution, J. Licht, “The Doctrine of the Thanksgiving Scroll,” *IEJ* 6 (1956): 2, states, “insofar as we can judge now, DST is the work of one man.” For the revival of this view, cf. n. 13.

10 Sukenik, *Scrolls*, 39.

11 Gert Jeremias, *Der Lehrer der Gerechtigkeit*, SUNT 2 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1963); Kuhn, *Enderwartung*.

with both the Teacher-Psalms Hypothesis¹² and the rigid generic distinction between “Teacher” and “Community” Psalms¹³—little is now certain, including the conclusion that the collections are wholly sectarian in provenance.¹⁴ Concerning the Community Rule, of particular importance at present is the possible non-sectarian provenance of the Two Spirits Treatise, or TST (1QS III 13–IV 26),¹⁵ and the debatable extent to which its theology is representative of the Hodayot.¹⁶ Besides 1QS, the TST is extant in only one additional version of the Rule (4QSc v), and almost certainly never included in at least another (4QSD). Likewise, cols. x and x1, containing the *Maskil*’s Psalm, are absent from at least one copy (4QSe). Clearly, it would be a mistake to read the Hodayot and Rule texts as if they all reflect the same place and time in history and the same

- 12 In favour thereof: Michael C. Douglas, “Power and Praise in the Hodayot: A Literary Critical Study of 1QH 9:1–18:14” (PhD diss., The University of Chicago, 1997); idem, “The Teacher Hymn Hypothesis Revisited: New Data for an Old Crux,” *DSD* 6 (1999): 239–66; Carol A. Newsom, “Kenneth Burke Meets the Teacher of Righteousness: Rhetorical Strategies in the Hodayot and the Serek Ha-Yahad,” in *Of Scribes and Scrolls*, ed. Harold W. Attridge, John J. Collins, and Thomas H. Tobin (Lanham, MD: Univ Press of America, 1990), 121–31. Newsom, however, revised her view of the authorship of the Teacher Psalms in Newsom, *Symbolic Space*, 287–300; likewise skeptical is Angela Kim Harkins, “Who Is the Teacher of the Teacher Hymns? Re-Examining the Teacher Hymns Hypothesis Fifty Years Later,” in *A Teacher for All Generations: Essays in Honor of James C. VanderKam*, ed. Eric Mason et al., vol. 1, *SJSJ* 153 (Leiden: Brill, 2012), 449–67.
- 13 For the suggestion that 1QH^a “is an anthology of compositions which had a variety of backgrounds,” cf. Julie A. Hughes, *Scriptural Allusions and Exegesis in the Hodayot*, *STDJ* 59 (Leiden: Brill, 2006), 233, also 31, 232–33. Puech and Qimron would revive the position in favour of unity of authorship for the entire collection: cf. Puech, “Hodayot” in *Encyclopedia of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 2 vols. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000), 365–69; idem, *La croyance des Esséniens en la vie future: immortalité, résurrection, vie éternelle? histoire d’une croyance dans le Judaïsme ancien*, 2 v., *Études bibliques* (Paris: J. Gabalda, 1993), 336–38; (more tentatively) Elisha Qimron, *The Dead Sea Scrolls: The Hebrew Writings* (Jerusalem: Yad Ben-Zvi Press, 2010), 1:XXVIII–XXIX. For the evidence of a diversity of Hodayot collections, seeming at times to validate the distinction between Community and Teacher Psalms, cf. Eileen M. Schuller, “The Cave 4 Hodayot Manuscripts: A Preliminary Description,” *JQR* 85 (1994): 137–50, and the critical edition in *DJD* XXIX.
- 14 For the argument that cols. I–VIII of 1QH^a are non-sectarian, cf. Angela Kim Harkins, “The Community Hymns Classification: A Proposal for Further Differentiation,” *DSD* 15 (2008): 121–54. For a current critical evaluation of many of these issues, see Trine Bjørnung Hasselbalch, *Meaning and Context in the Thanksgiving Hymns: Linguistic and Rhetorical Perspectives on a Collection of Prayers from Qumran*, *EJL* 42 (Atlanta: SBL Press, 2015).
- 15 Cf. Lange, *Weisheit und Prädestination*, 126–32.
- 16 See below in this section, as well as n. 35.

authorial point of view.¹⁷ Nevertheless, more-or-less comprehensive forms of both the Rule texts and the Hodayot are preserved, in which all the material relevant to this investigation is collected in a single composition (1QS and possibly 4QS^b; 1QH^a and possibly 4QH^b);¹⁸ it is at least theoretically justifiable therefore to ask how the parts might illuminate each other.

Some additional grounds suggest that the Community Rule and the Hodayot are profitably read together. They are associated with the enigmatic figure of the *Maskil*,¹⁹ mention of whom may be reconstructed at the beginning of the Community Rule,²⁰ prefaces the TST (1QS III 13), concludes the regulations (1QS IX 12), and is found in the material introducing the times of worship and the so-called "Psalm of the *Maskil*" (1QS IX 21). Likewise, the *Maskil* is prominent in 1QH^a, being mentioned in the "preface" to at least four psalms (or groups of psalms) (1QH^a v 12 [partially reconstructed];²¹ VII 21 [partially reconstructed]; XX 7 [=4QH^a 8 ii 10; 4QH^b 12 ii 3]; XXV 34),²² and the enigmatic figure even speaks in XX 14, giving precedent to the suggestion that it is also the *Maskil* who speaks in the first person in 1QS X–XI. Beyond the mere mention of a figure, overlapping content, language, and evidence of liturgical practice further link these texts.²³ Moreover, the inclusion in 1QS of a psalm very much in the style of the Hodayot, particularly those which are immediately preceded by reference to the *Maskil*, provides a sort of hinge between the works, inviting

-
- 17 Cf. John J. Collins, *Beyond the Qumran Community: The Sectarian Movement of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2010); idem, "Beyond the Qumran Community: Social Organization in the Dead Sea Scrolls," *DSD* 16 (2009): 351–69.
 - 18 Harkins would dispute the claim that material corresponding to 1QH^a I–VIII was contained in 4QH^b; cf. "A New Proposal," 125–30. Contrast Schuller, *DJD* XXIX, 125–31.
 - 19 Cf. Charlotte Hempel, "Maskil(im) and Rabbim: From Daniel to Qumran," in *Biblical Traditions in Transmission: Essays in Honour of Michael A. Knibb*, ed. Charlotte Hempel and Judith Lieu, *JSJSup* 111 (Leiden: Brill, 2006), 133–56; Carol A. Newsom, "The Sage in the Literature of Qumran: The Functions of the *Maškil*," in *The Sage in Israel and the Ancient Near East*, ed. John G. Gammie and Leo G. Perdue (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1990), 373–82; Lange, *Weisheit und Prädestination*, 144–48.
 - 20 Jean Carmignac, "Conjecture sur la première ligne de la Règle de la Communauté," *RevQ* 2 (1959): 85–87.
 - 21 Cf. Émile Puech, "Quelques aspects de la restauration du Rouleau des Hymnes (1QH)," *JJS* 39 (1988): 52; idem, "Un hymne essénien en partie retrouvé et les Béatitudes: 1QH v 12–VI 18 (=col. XIII–XIV 7) et 4QBéat.," *RevQ* 13 (1988): 59–88.
 - 22 Puech, "Quelques aspects," 52–53, suggests that there were originally five such headings (one also at the beginning of the scroll), introducing five sections, patterned on the five books in the Psalter.
 - 23 Evidence in the Hodayot of a community structure resembling that described in 1QS may be found particularly in 1QH^a VI 28–33 and XX 25–27.

one to read the *Maskil's* psalm in tandem with not only the Community Rule but also, by extension, the Hodayot.

A legitimate question is often raised about the effort to read poetic/psalmic material for the theology it contains: Is one well-advised to do so? However one might want to reply to this in general,²⁴ there are special considerations applying to the present material. In his early exploration of the doctrine of the Thanksgiving Psalms, Jacob Licht expressed the conviction that the author's "poetry proves to be to some extent a lyrical elaboration of speculative themes." While he did not think that doctrine was meant to be inferred from the text, since it was written for those already familiar with the sect's teachings, he remarked that "the repetitiveness of phrases and motifs" assists the outsider, for "in the end a pattern of thought emerges." But more importantly, Licht made use of the TST—"a summary statement of the sect's doctrine"—in order to read the Hodayot (DST) for the beliefs reflected therein:²⁵ "the result of the examination of DST can be checked with DSD [=IQS] and, where fragmentary, completed by a reference to an authentic document."²⁶ Licht did not adduce much evidence to support the claim that the psalms elaborate on the doctrine of the sect. However, Siegfried Schulz pointed to four characteristics of the statements concerning nothingness, misery, and justification in order to argue that they emerge from catechetical material of the *yahad*, namely, their presence in multiple genres, formulaic character, impersonal teaching style, and didactic quality;²⁷ such characteristics suggested to him, furthermore, their use for initiates in the Covenant Renewal Ceremony.²⁸ The *Sitz im Leben* of

24 For a brief consideration of the issues, cf. Eileen M. Schuller, "Petitionary Prayer and the Religion of Qumran," in *Religion in the Dead Sea Scrolls*, ed. John J. Collins and Robert A. Kugler, SDBSRL (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000), 32–34.

25 Cf. J. Licht, "An Analysis of the Treatise on the Two Spirits in DSD," in *Aspects of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, ed. Chaim Rabin and Yigael Yadin (Jerusalem: Magnes Press, 1965), 88–99.

26 Licht, "Doctrine," 2–4. It is important to state that Licht recognized that "there are considerable differences both in details and in stress" between the documents. Note, too, Lawrence Schiffman's not too different method of exploration of the "Faith and Belief" of the sect; he refers to the "*Thanksgiving Hymns'* author's . . . desire to convey his views through poetry" noting that a "basic theological picture of the sect emerges primarily from these two documents," referring also to the Community Rule; *Reclaiming the Dead Sea Scrolls: The History of Judaism, the Background of Christianity, the Lost Library of Qumran* (New York: Doubleday, 1994), 145–57, here 145–46.

27 Schulz, "Rechtfertigung," 167–71.

28 Ibid., 171–77; cf. also, "For What Purpose were the Hodayot Written?" in Svend Holm-Nielsen, *Hodayot: Psalms from Qumran* (Aarhus: Universitetsforlaget, 1960), 332–48; and Kuhn, *Enderwartung*, 29–33.

these texts, or their respective units, whether liturgical or private-devotional, is a matter of debate,²⁹ but their didactic intention is a separate issue and, with the reconstruction of the original placement of fragments in 1QH^a, may be shown more clearly than was previously possible.

The Hodayot's affinities with the corpus of Wisdom literature have been emphasized of late.³⁰ This lends added weight to the presupposition that its statements concerning creation and anthropology, major concerns of the Wisdom corpus, are the product of reflection and the intent to instruct. More specifically, the placement of fragments 15a, 15b i, and 31 at the beginning of the psalm that fills the preserved parts of col. v furnishes perhaps as clear a (fragmentary) statement of didactic intent with regard to anthropology as is found nearly anywhere in Second Temple literature:

12 [מזמור למ] שכיל להתנפל לפני אל [מעשי אל
13 [] ולהבין פותאים [] ° [] ° [] ° עולם []
14 [] ° ולהבין אנוש ב [] בשר וסוד רוחי [] ° התהלכו

12 [A psalm for the In]structor, that he may prostrate himself befor[e God
]deeds of God

13 [] and that the simple may understand [] [] [] y forever
14 [] t and that humankind may understand concerning [] flesh
and the council of the spirits of [] they walk (1QH^a v)

29 Around thirteen years ago, Eileen Schuller noted that scholars seemed to be weighing in favour of the private-devotional setting; cf. "Some Reflections on the Function and Use of Poetical Texts among the Dead Sea Scrolls," 177–79. She noted her own contrasting suggestion that the contents of certain Cave 4 copies of the Hodayot (e.g., 4Q427 and 4Q431) may reflect their use in a liturgical setting. For the private-devotional setting, cf. Bilhah Nitzan, *Qumran Prayer and Religious Poetry*, STDJ 12 (Leiden: Brill, 1994), 321–55. Harkins' recent studies suggesting that the Hodayot were used in the practice of "performative prayer" and "meditation" seem consistent with the private-devotional setting, although there is an acknowledgement of liturgical elements and a strong focus on religious and ritual experience; cf. Harkins, *Reading with an "I,"* 267, 273, also 4–8; eadem, "Performative Reading"; eadem, "A New Proposal." Esther Chazon, however, detects evidence of liturgical interest and a *Sitz im Leben* in the community's worship in the editorial shaping of 1QH^a around the theme of praising God together with the angels; "Liturgical Function."

30 This applies mostly to the "Community Psalms"; cf., e.g., Berg, "Religious Epistemologies," 153–99; H. Antonissen, "Die weisheitliche Terminologie in den 'Hodayot': ein kontextbezogener Überblick," *Leqach* 7 (2007): 1–15; Goff, "Reading Wisdom"; Tanzer, "Sages at Qumran."

The didactic intention of this psalm—for the *משכיל* (“Instructor/Sage”)—is stated both in principle and in particular. It is intended to bring about “understanding” (2x *להבין*) for the “simple” (*פתי*) and “humankind” (*אנוש*). If the content of the psalm is any indication, the text may have stated that the simple would be instructed in the ways of God, but the damage completely prevents a reconstruction; one can, however, discern the subject(s) about which understanding is to be gained by humankind (l. 14): the “[*יצר* or *רוח*]³¹ of flesh” and “the council of the spirits of []” in which humankind walks. These topics are taken up, after the “deeds of God” (cf. l. 12 [and 13?]) are described (ll. 15–30), in ll. 31–33, where the emphasis falls on “flesh,” and vi 22–27, where the emphasis falls on “spirit(s).” An effort to consider the sect’s anthropology, therefore, would be ill-advised to dismiss the statements made in this psalm.

The didactic intention of these psalms, therefore, is now more securely grounded in the explicit aims of the text than was obvious to Licht. This same material reconstruction of col. v, moreover, allows one to establish a strong presupposition in favour of reading the Hodayot in connection with the TST, at least insofar as the former can be associated with the Instructor. Note the close agreement in the statement of didactic intent and scope between 1QH^a v 12–14 (cited above) and the preface to the TST:

13 לַמְשָׁכִיל לְהַבִּין וּלְלַמֵּד אֶת כּוֹל בְּנֵי אֹר בְּתוֹלְדוֹת כּוֹל בְּנֵי אִישׁ
14 לְכוֹל מִיָּנִי רוּחוֹתָם בְּאוֹתוֹתָם לְמַעֲשֵׂיהֶם בְּדוֹרוֹתָם וּלְפִקּוּדַת נִגְיֵיהֶם עִם
15 קִצֵּי שְׁלוֹמָם

¹³ *Blank* For the Instructor, that he should instruct and teach all the sons of light about the nature of all the sons of man, ¹⁴ concerning all the ranks of their spirits, in accordance with their signs, concerning their deeds in their generations, and concerning the visitation of their punishments and ¹⁵ the times of their reward. (1QS III)

The didactic intent is explicit in both col. v of the Hodayot and the TST, the anticipated actor is the same, and the subject alike is anthropology. Moreover, the similarities go beyond these formal agreements and extend to the content

31 Puech suggested *יצר* on the basis of his detection of the traces of a *resh*; “Un hymne essénien,” 63, 70. Stegemann, DJD XL, 78–79, saw only blackened leather here, while admitting that there is space for a word. Besides *יצר* (cf. XVIII 25; XXIV 6) the only other obvious candidate supplied by the Hodayot usage of “flesh” is *רוח* (cf. ll. 15 and 30, as well as IV 37). Qimron, *Hebrew Writings*, 1:64, also reconstructs *יצר*, without indicating the detection of a *resh*.

that these units introduce, as scholars have noted.³² But the differences, too, should be stated and assessed. Already evident in these introductory statements is the most critical distinction between the Hodayot and the TST: the explicit dualism of light and darkness, with their angels, sons, and spirits, is absent from the Hodayot. The Hodayot are not wanting of dualism (cf., e.g., 1QH^a VII 27–33; XVIII 26–32), but they do lack a fixed terminology articulating clear conceptual boundaries that are at the same time cosmic, ethical, and psychological, such as is found in the TST.³³ How significant is this difference? The same features are lacking in the *Maskil's* Psalm in cols. x and xi of the Community Rule. Both the Hodayot and the *Maskil's* Psalm place greater focus on the internal dynamic between the self as a site of negativity and as object of gracious divine action rather than the external contrast between Group A and Group B. These different emphases need not be construed as contradictions. The TST itself describes clearly both aspects of the sect's worldview.³⁴ A further distinction that has been drawn between the Hodayot and the TST concerns their pneumatology in particular: the prevailing concept in the Hodayot appears to be that the spirit of God is received upon entrance to the

32 Tigchelaar, *To Increase Learning*, 194–207.

33 I adopt the terminological classifications for speaking of dualisms made by Jörg Frey, "Different Patterns of Dualistic Thought in the Qumran Library: Reflections on Their Background and History," in *Legal Texts and Legal Issues: Proceedings of the Second Meeting of the International Organization for Qumran Studies*, Cambridge, 1995: *Published in Honour of Joseph M. Baumgarten*, ed. Joseph M. Baumgarten et al., STDJ 23 (Leiden: Brill, 1997), 280–85. These are 1) *metaphysical*: two opposed coeternal and causal powers of equal rank; 2) *cosmic*: the world and humanity divided in two, but the division is neither coeternal nor strictly causal; often encompasses several of the following dualisms; 3) *spatial*: spatial oppositions (e.g., heaven and earth) can describe a cosmic dualism, but may also function non-dualistically; 4) *eschatological/temporal*: two opposed aeons (not merely an expectation of final judgement); 5) *ethical*: humankind divided in two by virtues and vices; 6) *soteriological*: humankind divided by faith and disbelief; 7) *theological/prophetic*: God vs. humanity, Creator vs. creation, but if the opposition is not particularly emphasized the label dualistic is to be avoided; 8) *physical*: matter and spirit strictly divided; 9) *anthropological*: a subset of the previous, the opposition of body and soul; 10) *psychological*: two opposite principles at war within human beings.

34 These contraries might be attributed to different compositional layers or different generic categories; cf. Jean Duhaime, "Cohérence structurelle et tensions internes dans l'Instruction sur les Deux Esprits (1QS III 13–IV 26)," in *Wisdom and Apocalypticism in the Dead Sea Scrolls and in the Biblical Tradition*, ed. Florentino García Martínez, ETL 168 (Leuven: Peeters, 2003), 103–31; idem, "Instruction sur les deux esprits et les interpolations dualistes a Qumrân (1QS III, 13–IV, 26)," *RB* 84 (1977): 566–94; Hartmut Stegemann, "Zu Textbestand und Grundgedanken von 1QS III, 13–IV, 26," *RevQ* 13 (1988): 95–130.

sect, whereas the TST implies that one's predetermined spiritual condition is operative from birth.³⁵ Clearly, there are important differences between the TST and the Hodayot. Nevertheless, the indications that these texts share some literary relationship as well as didactic intent and even association with the same figure establish sufficient grounds to set them alongside each other in an interpretive conversation, as it were.

The Sectarian Psalms, then, *ask* to be read as didactic literature,³⁶ whose concern is to elaborate on the mysterious divine plan (see below) in relation to the cosmos and anthropology. The thesis of a didactic intent coheres well with the function Carol Newsom attributes to this literature from a socio-rhetorical perspective. She notes that "sectarian movements must be particularly explicit and intentional in constructing the language and practices that will give tangible shape to their world," for they "had to detach members from their prior identities and offer them new ones." Newsom demonstrates how

35 For a history of this discussion, cf. Arthur Everett Sekki, *The Meaning of Ruach at Qumran* (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1987), 7–69, who concludes negatively, that these are not compatible thoughts. He finds the TST pneumatology elsewhere only in 1QH^a vii and 4Q186 (cf. pp. 221–23). Cf., too, John R. Levison, "Two Spirits in Qumran Theology," in *The Bible and the Dead Sea Scrolls*, ed. James Charlesworth, vol. 2 (Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2006), 169–94; Robert W. Kvalvaag, "The Spirit in Human Beings in Some Qumran Non-Biblical Texts," in *Qumran Between Old and New Testaments*, ed. Frederick H. Cryer and Thomas L. Thompson, JSOTSup 290 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1998), 159–80. Kvalvaag maintains that while the TST conceives of God creating two spirits for the human being, the Hodayot conceive of only one. Interpretive cruxes abound. The thesis that the texts differ seems sound, but difficulties remain: one must explain 1QH^a iv 29, 35–37; v 14 and vi 22–23, which closely resemble the TST's emphasis on a plurality of spirits in contexts that also speak of the singular spirit of the human being (iv 37; v 32–33), and it must address precisely what the multiplicity of spirits in either composition signifies, i.e., physiological ("animating spirit"/essence of a person), psychological ("inclination/disposition"), or trans-human, metaphysical ("angels/demons/spirits") realities or some combination of these. Probably the most significant difference in the anthropology of the works, and one which largely explains their differently constructed pneumatologies, is the report of the Hodayot that the expectation of purification by the spirit of God in the TST at the time of visitation is already experienced in the life of the community. (This might confirm the earlier provenance of the TST.) The hastening of this re-creative act of God would be testament to the Hodayot's even more radical anthropological pessimism and would explain the diminished significance of a teaching on *two* spirits, for the efficacy (though not necessarily the presence) of the "good" spirit would be negated.

36 For a wide-ranging study of didactic psalms, cf. Matthew E. Gordley, *Teaching through Song in Antiquity*, WUNT 302 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2011), 254–67, for the Hodayot.

this is achieved through the Bakhtinian phenomenon of “reaccentuation”: “Not infrequently in the Hodayot the conventional exaggeration of pious clichés (e.g., ‘no one can direct his steps’) may be taken not in the ordinary sense as a loose expression of pious humility but as the very basis for understanding one’s situation.”³⁷ If Newsom is right, it would be a mistake to dismiss the Hodayot’s statements concerning human nature as the poetic reflex of pious conventions. Expressions of radical anthropology in the Hodayot sustain and shape their readers’ unique place in the world. They should be taken with their full semantic value and investigated for the convictions they express.

Creation and the Divine Plan

Creation³⁸ is a major theme of the Hodayot, especially of psalms that have been described as *Gemeindelieder* or “Community Psalms.” Daniel J. Harrington notes of 1QH^a as a whole that “creation often provides the horizon against which other theological concerns are developed.”³⁹ If one spoke of the Community Psalms specifically, it could be claimed that creation is *the* major theme of such Hodayot. Some nuancing of the term “creation” is necessary, however. There is little prolonged concern with the physical world as an entity in itself, but creation in the sense of the origin and coming-to-being of things is central. The Sectarian Psalms often explicitly preface or interweave their own anthropological statements with reflections on the preordained orderliness of the cosmos and human history, much as the TST inserts its famous statements that “from the God of knowledge stems all there is and all there shall be” (1QS III 15–16) between announcing its anthropological concerns and then developing them within an epochal scheme. Similarly, in the midst of its reflections on human lowliness (1QS XI 9–11; 11–15) the *Maskil’s* Psalm affirms, “By his knowledge everything shall come into being, and all that does exist

37 Newsom, *Symbolic Space*, 95, 193–96; cf., too, eadem, “Pairing Research Questions and Theories of Genre: A Case Study of the Hodayot,” *DSD* 17 (2010): 270–88.

38 For a survey of terminology for “creation” in the DSS, cf. Florentino García Martínez, “Creation in the Dead Sea Scrolls,” in *Qumranica Minora*, ed. Eibert J. C. Tigchelaar, STDJ 64 (Leiden: Brill, 2007), 219–40. For a survey of the conceptual significance of creation in the DSS, cf. Bilhah Nitzan, “The Idea of Creation and Its Implications in Qumran Literature,” in *Creation in Jewish and Christian Tradition*, ed. Henning Graf Reventlow and Yair Hoffman, JSOTSup 319 (London: Sheffield Academic Press, 2002), 240–64.

39 Daniel J. Harrington, “Creation,” in *EDSS*, 155. Cf., also Matthew E. Gordley, “Creation Imagery in Qumran Hymns and Prayers,” *JJS* 59 (2008): 252–72.

he establishes with his calculations and nothing is done outside of him" (l. 11). Armin Lange argues that such texts expand on the sapiential idea of "an ethical and social order according to which God created the world and ordered human life."⁴⁰ The sapiential order is developed to include both a cosmic dualism, encompassing an historical order of epochs, and an "ethical" or "soteriological" dualism, according to which an individual's participation on one side or the other is predestined.⁴¹

Three psalms in the Hodayot may briefly illustrate the idea of predetermined order that governs the cosmos, history, and anthropology. The "Creation Psalm" of col. ix is thoroughly pervaded by the notion of a divine intentionality that underlies not only an initial cosmic order characterized by a mirrored duality between heaven (ll. 11–15) and earth (ll. 15–20, with an extended anthropological component, ll. 20–22) but also a history that unfolds and concludes according to the divine blueprint: "According to your wi[ll] everything [comes] to pass" (l. 22). The psalm knows no dichotomy between "creation" and "salvation-history"; it is all one and the same, enfolded in the wise (חכמה, ll. 8, 9, 16, 21) predetermination (הכין, ll. 19, 21; פלג, l. 20) of God. The ethical dimension of the cosmic blueprint comes to the fore in the opening, but fractured, lines of the psalm beginning at 1QH^a v 12, where a "two-ways" topos is blended into the creative intention for the cosmos: "you yourself have revealed the ways of truth and the works of evil, wisdom and folly [] righteousness [] their works, truth [] []^h and folly. All have walke[d] []^m and eternal mercies for all their time[s] for peace or (for) destruction" (ll. 20–23). And in col. xx of 1QH^a the thanksgivings and prayers of the *Maskil* are to be regulated by the fixed alteration of the "dominion of light" (מבוא אור לממש[לתו]) and the "dominion of darkness" (ממשלת חושך), the cycle of which is associated with "the birthing of time, the foundations of the seasons, and the cycle of the festivals in the order fixed by their signs, for all their dominion in proper order, reliably (לכול ממשלתם) בתכון נאמנה, at the command of God" (ll. 7–12). This order points beyond itself: "It is a testimony (תעודה) of that which exists. This is what shall be, and there shall be no end. Apart from it nothing has existed nor shall yet be. For the God of knowledge has established it, and there is none other with him" (ll. 12–14). Precisely what correlations exist between this cosmic order and all that exists or shall be might be glimpsed through fragmentary lines in the context which immediately follows. In a reflection on appointed times (מועדים, l. 20) of eschatological judgement (ll. 14–25), those who fear God are assured: "In the time of your [i.e., God's] glory they will rejoice . . . fo[r] according to their insight you

40 Lange, "Wisdom and Predestination in the Dead Sea Scrolls," 340.

41 Cf., too, Goff, "Reading Wisdom," 272–76.

bring them near, and according to their dominion they serve you in [their] division[s, neither] turning from you nor transgressing your word" (ll. 25–27). Subject matter, poetic parallels, and common vocabulary all suggest an overlapping interpretive relationship between the structure of creation, including the division between heaven and earth and the intersecting periods of light and of darkness, and the binary structure of human history and society as well as the orderliness of the community itself. The homology is accounted for by the single divine plan giving expression to each.

The order which grounds creation enables a sort of hermeneutical revolution. Both the creation, its cosmos and history, and the scriptural texts of creation can be read for signs of a prior reality, if one has been given insight into the divine plan (מחשבה). Carol Newsom demonstrates this in the TST, which shares so much language with Gen 1. She argues that 1QS 3–4 manages "to insert itself into that space" behind the moment(s) of creation that is the focus of Gen 1: "It establishes itself as the pre-text for Genesis 1. Where Genesis 1 is concerned with creation, 1QS 3–4 is concerned with the מחשבה that grounds creation. It is not just that 1QS 3–4 is to be read in the light of Genesis 1, but that *henceforth Genesis 1 must be read in the light of 1QS 3–4*."⁴² For instance, whereas the division of light from darkness in Gen 1:4b–5 formerly "disclosed only God's organization of the created world, now it alludes as well to an antecedent spiritual reality that informs the structures of creation," and "the aesthetic feature of balanced pairs in Genesis 1 now takes on a moral resonance." Newsom focuses on Gen 1, yet the TST shares much also with Gen 2–3. The Hodayot clearly share the comprehensive view of the cosmos and its history as the product of direct, divine intentionality; this chapter will suggest that its deterministic view of creation has influenced the reception of Gen 2–3 as well.

From such statements concerning the divinely determined orderliness of the cosmos and human history, perhaps most scholars have been persuaded that the Hodayot and the TST express a strong form of determinism, in which the course of history and individual fate are not only divinely foreknown but also unilaterally predestined.⁴³ Alternatively, such texts might be read to claim

42 Newsom, *Symbolic Space*, 86. Emphasis added.

43 A key text is 1QH^a VII 25–35. Cf. Barclay, *Paul and the Gift*, 255–65; Eugene H. Merrill, *Qumran and Predestination: A Theological Study of the Thanksgiving Hymns*, STDJ 8 (Leiden: Brill, 1975); and Philip S. Alexander, "Predestination and Free Will in the Theology of the Dead Sea Scrolls," in *Divine and Human Agency in Paul and His Cultural Environment*, ed. John M. G. Barclay and Simon J. Gathercole (London: T & T Clark, 2008), 27–49. For the view that determinism in the TST is limited to world-structures and does not concern human willing, cf. Emmanuel O. Tukasi, *Determinism and Petitionary Prayer in John and*

that God has foreordained the course of history to the extent that God created the world with perfect foreknowledge of the course it would take, in part due to the capacities of self-determination which would inhere in it. Between these alternatives one might add the position according to which God foreordains the structures, the dualistic order of the cosmos, but leaves individuals under the power of spiritual forces outside and within them to find their place within this order. According to the latter two views, human willing would then be predetermined not in a strong sense but in a secondary sense that is contingent upon the impossibility of there being any deficiency in God's (fore-) knowledge.

In regard to the construction of anthropology in the Hodayot via creation traditions, the second and third interpretation allow in theory for the explanation that human nature is what it is primarily due to some more or less freely chosen act of rebellion. But this explanation is contradicted by the sectarian psalms' association of a pessimistic anthropology with divine creative activity. This association will become apparent by the continued allusion to scriptural traditions concerning the creation or created nature of humankind and also by the Hodayot's explicit reference to God's creative activity in the determination of human nature and destiny, including its baseness. Thus, it would seem that the qualities of being-human are comprehended within the positive, not merely the permissive, will of the Creator. On this suggestion the overwhelming baseness of human nature in the Hodayot does not appear the part of an "irrational intrusion" into a good creation. Rather, human nature, as it is now known, would be a native component of God's creation and yet would not in itself possess the means to direct its own steps according to the norms and standards of God's holiness and righteousness.

In view of the above, one might expect the Hodayot to have little use for the *Chaoskampf* as an explanation for the origins or present state of the world, and in a sense that is correct. The entire course of creation—certainly its major features—is the product of an all-powerful, all-knowing divine being. But the influence and power of that early mythological framework is felt in the modified dualism of the community that describes the opposition of certain

the Dead Sea Scrolls: An Ideological Reading of John and the Rule of the Community (1QS), LSTS 66 (London: T & T Clark, 2008). So too Paul Heger: "I vigorously dispute the claim of a doctrine of individual predestination in the Qumran writings. Scripture is replete with explicit exhortations to repentance and resulting forgiveness—the utter antithesis of predestination—and it is preposterous to attribute to Qumran a doctrine patently conflicting with one of Scripture's essential ideologies"; *Challenges to Conventional Opinions on Qumran and Enoch Issues*, STDJ 100 (Leiden: Brill, 2012), 12.

metaphysical beings to those angels and human beings who are favoured by God, as well as in the terrors posed to the elect by those realms that are typically associated with chaos. These vestiges of the myth, however, do not function as first-order explanations, for behind everything stands the will of the Creator (cf. 1QM XIII 10–18).

Anthropogony: *Adam's Dust*

The Sektarian Psalms are perhaps infamous for expressing, as Jacob Licht put it, “an almost pathological abhorrence of human nature.”⁴⁴ Carol Newsom describes these statements as cultivating the “masochistic sublime” in which “the self enacts its own nothingness in radical contrast to the being of God.”⁴⁵ They reinforce the dominant subjectivity inculcated by the Hodayot, “the fundamental characterization of the speaker as recipient of a divine gift.”⁴⁶ She contrasts the subjectivity of Israel's Psalms, where the language of self-abasement is primarily that of misery rather than self-loathing, and where the speaker is still capable of conceiving of the self as an operating moral agent in whom is the power “simply to do what is right” and who can “unashamedly name[s] his moral accomplishments.”⁴⁷ There is in the Hodayot, in contrast, a “total self-repudiation.” This section will highlight the manner that statements of human loathing reflect the perception that created human nature is incongruous with the high destiny God has predetermined for elect humanity.

The statements of human loathing are a persistent feature of the Hodayot, integrated into the fabric of its conceptual world. They often appear in form-critically distinct units (particularly, the *Niedrigkeitsdoxologien*), with numerous variations on highly stylized phrases. They appear also in less stereotypical fashion, for instance in cols. IV 33–37; VII 25–27; XI 22; XV 20–21; XIX 15, 22–25. They sometimes form the major contrast in a psalm on which thanks is offered to God for being the object of God's electing grace, as in XV 29–36; XV 37–XVI 4; and XVII 38–XVIII 14. They appear not only in the Community Psalms but on a handful of occasions in typical Teacher Psalms (XI 24–26; XII 30–34), though many scholars have not been convinced of their originality in this setting;⁴⁸ if it

44 Licht, “Doctrine,” 10–11.

45 Newsom, *Symbolic Space*, 220.

46 Ibid., 206. The priority of divine agency and gift is argued at length by Maston, *Agency*.

47 Newsom, *Symbolic Space*, 219–20, 269–71, in the latter instance citing Ps 119.

48 Michael Douglas provides a convenient chart of the different classifications which have been made of compositions and units within the “Teacher-block”: “Teacher Hymn,” 245.

is proper to speak of a *collection* of Teacher Psalms extending from cols. IX/X to cols. XVII/XIX,⁴⁹ then statements of human loathing are amply attested there (cf., additionally, IX 23–25; XV 35, 39–40; XVIII 5–8; XIX 15, 22–24). Moreover, the remnants of the sometimes extremely fragmentary cols. XX–XXII indicate an unparalleled degree of preoccupation with human baseness, returning to the theme over and over, as if in a refrain.⁵⁰ Thus the anthropology of lowliness and loathsomeness is a diffuse feature of the Hodayot in general, but finding a high concentration in some Community Psalms in particular, and generally most recognizable in those clearly demarcated chains of self-deprecation known as *Niedrigkeitsdoxologien*.

*Niedrigkeitsdoxologie (and Elendsbetrachtung)*⁵¹

The very name they have adopted for them indicates that scholars connect the Lowliness Doxologies to the biblical Doxologies of Judgement or *Gerichtsdoxologien*, declarations of God's justice in meeting out punishment. Though H.-W. Kuhn coined the neologism for the Qumran texts, it was J. Becker who first compared them to the form-critical category of Doxology of Judgement.⁵² The Hodayot produce statements of *Gerichtsdoxologie*

49 Douglas argues on literary-critical grounds that cols. x–xvii are likely the work of a single author (whose “signature phrase” is *הגבירה בי*), that col. ix was added as an introduction, and that cols. xviii–xx 6 may have formed a gradually expanded conclusion; cf. Douglas, “Teacher Hymn”; idem, “Power and Praise.”

50 ילוד אשה: xxi 2, 9 (both partially reconstructed); בשר: xxi 7, 9, 23; איש פשע: xxi 13; און עפר: xxi 13; יצר עולה: xxi 12; יצר (ה) חמר: xxi 19, 31; יצר: xx 29, 35; xxi 38; xxi 12; יצר (ה) עפר: xxi 30; יצר (ה) עפר: xxi 17, 25, 34; לב האבן: xxi 12; לב עפר: xxi 10; און ואפס: xxi 30; [מגב] ל און ואפס: xxi 30; מבור נדה: xx 28; מקוי עפר: xxi 26; מקוה אפר: xx 28–29; מדור חושך: xx 28; מגבל [במים]: xx 28; עפר: xx 27, 29 (2x), 34; xxi 12, 20 [4QH^b 13 3]; xxi 8, 30; עפר ואפר: xx 30; ערות קלון: xx 28. And cf. the interrogatives: xx 30–31, 34–38; xxi 4–5, 7, 12, 24–26, 32; xxi 29–30.

51 In the category *Niedrigkeitsdoxologie*, cf. 1QH^a iv 29–32; v 30–35; vii 34; ix 23b–29; xii 30–34; xv 31–36, 38–40; xviii 5–14; xx 27–39; xxi 2–3, 7–13, 24–26, 31–38; xxi 8, 12, 19, 28–30; xxiii 24–28; xxvi 32–40; and also 1QS xi 9–11, 20–22; 4Q400 2 6–8; 4Q511 28+29 2–5. Perhaps also to be included: 1QH^a iii 27–32; viii 12–14; and 4Q433 1 1–10. Typically included in the *Elendsbetrachtungen*, which are supposed to lack the affirmation of justice or doxology, are 1QH^a xi 24b–26 and xix 22–25b, but the doxological element is not far from either (xi 20–23; xix 21). Cf. the discussions of Lichtenberger, *Menschenbild*, 73–75; Tanzer, “Sages at Qumran,” 20–21; Kuhn, *Enderwartung*, 26–29.

52 Cf., e.g., Exod 9:27; Ezra 9:15; Neh 9:33; Dan 9:7–10. Originally identified by F. Horst, “Die Doxologien im Amosbuch,” *ZAW* 47 (1929): 45–54. Other important early studies include: James L. Crenshaw, *Hymnic Affirmation of Divine Justice* (Missoula, MT: Scholars Press for the Society of Biblical Literature, 1975); G. von Rad, “Gerichtsdoxologie,” in *Schalom: Studien zu Glaube und Geschichte Israels: Alfred Jepsen zum 70sten Geburtstag*, ed. Karl-

(1QH^a IV 32; V 36; VI 26–27; VIII 27; IX 8, 27–28; XII 31–32, 37–38, 41; XVII 9–10; XIX 10–12, 20–21; XX 22–23, 33–34) which can still be distinguished from or within the *Niedrigkeitsdoxologien*. The former have been studied by Esther Chazon, who emphasizes that the contexts in which such statements are found now reflect the sectarian determinism and dualism of the sect,⁵³ for the righteousness of God takes on the added nuance of mercy or graciousness for the one offering praise.⁵⁴

The Lowliness Doxologies are characterized by some fairly consistent formal markers.⁵⁵ They typically begin with an interrogative particle, such as *מה*, *איכה*, *מי*, or the first person pronoun (*אני*), either of which may be preceded by a disjunctive *waw*; the pronoun “I” is generally prominent throughout, the root *צדק* is often present, and the most common way to refer to humanity relates to its earthly origins, such as in the terms “a creature of clay” (*יצר[ה] חמר*), “structure of dust” (*מבנה עפר*), or “a thing kneaded with water” (*מגבל[ה] מים*).⁵⁶ They often pile anthropological pejorative upon pejorative, emphasizing less specific sins or acts of sinning and more the offensiveness of the human condition *per se*.

The content or subject-matter of the Lowliness Doxologies is, despite their name, more than the insignificance of the human person or speaker. Also prominent is the sinfulness endemic in human nature and coming to expression in human deeds (cf., especially, XII 30–31; XV 39–40; 1QS XI 9–10). And perhaps equally revealing are the aspersions cast against the impurity of

Heinz Bernhardt, *Arbeiten zur Theologie* (Stuttgart: Calver Verlag, 1971), 28–37. Cf. now Mark J. Boda, *Praying the Tradition* (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1999), 55–61; Rodney Alan Werline, *Penitential Prayer in Second Temple Judaism: The Development of a Religious Institution* (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1998), 1–4.

53 Cf. Esther Chazon, “Tradition and Innovation in Sectarian Religious Poetry,” in *Prayer and Poetry in the Dead Sea Scrolls and Related Literature: Essays in Honor of Eileen Schuller on the Occasion of Her 65th Birthday*, ed. Jeremy Penner, Ken M. Penner, and Cecilia Wassen, STDJ 98 (Leiden: Brill, 2012), 55–68. On the two forms, *Gerichtsdoxologie* and *Niedrigkeitsdoxologie*, in the Hodayot, cf. Hultgren, *Covenant*, 437–43.

54 Chazon, “Tradition and Innovation”; cf., too, Newsom, *Symbolic Space*, 267–68.

55 Kuhn, *Enderwartung*, 26–29.

56 On the last phrase, cf. Greenfield and Lichtenberger, who maintain that the phrase foreshadows the rabbinic interpretation (e.g., Midr. Gen. 14) according to which God forms Adam from dust moistened with the recently watered earth (Gen 2:6–7): Jonas C. Greenfield, “Root GBL in Mishnaic Hebrew and in the Hymnic Literature from Qumran,” *RevQ* 2 (1959): 157–58, 161 n. 31; Lichtenberger, *Menschenbild*, 81–84. Cf. also Meyer, “מגבל,” in *Theologisches Wörterbuch zu den Qumrantexten*, ed. Heinz-Josef Fabry and Ulrich Dahmen (Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 2013), 2:570–72, although I am now less sure that a choice needs to be made between creation and procreation; cf., too, n. 102.

humanity—terms for sexual impurities are applied to a general abhorrence of human nature as a whole (1QH^a v 32–33; IX 23–24; XX 27–28).⁵⁷ Any attempt to interpret these texts must account for all three features—finitude, sinfulness, and impurity—and not simply the first of these.

The broad context in which these texts occur is typically God's omnipotence and omniscience as shown in deterministic creative acts and intentions, as described above. The *immediate* context to which the disjunctive *waw* responds is the experience of election, often exemplified either by revealed knowledge (cf. v 30–31; IX 23; XVIII 5–9) and/or participation in the community of the elect, both human and angelic (1QS XI 9; 1QH^a XI 23–25; XX 27; XXVI 35–36). While, in past studies, emphasis has been placed on the Lowliness Doxologies almost exclusively as a response to the experience of privileged knowledge, this rather misses the more profound disjunction they form, that between human nature and participation in the (heavenly) communion of worshipers, which such knowledge partially enables; this contrast may introduce the doxology and/or emerge within it (as in v 34; XXI 24–26).⁵⁸

The Lowliness Doxologies differ from their biblical namesake, the *Gerichtsdoxologien*, in their disconnection from historical events (personal or national) and grounding in general circumstances.⁵⁹ As J. Becker describes, "Nicht des Menschen Verfehlung gegenüber den geschichtlichen Heilstaten am Volk Israel, sondern seine Nichtigkeit angesichts der Schöpfungstaten Gottes

57 From 1QH^a v 32–33: ערוה, "nakedness," "pudenda" (BDB); קלון, "ignominy," "dishonour" 1. of nation under fig. of woman = pudenda (Jer 13:26; Nah 3:5) (BDB); במקור, "spring," "fountain": 3. *source* of menstuous blood (Lev 12:7); 4. = *flow* of blood after child-birth (Lev 12:7) (BDB); נדה, "impurity" 1. especially of menstruation (BDB). Cf. Lichtenberger, *Menschenbild*, 84–85. Hultgren rejects Lichtenberger's conclusion that the term סוד הערוה קלן/סוד ערות draws from language concerning human sexuality to speak of the impurity of the human condition; instead, citing Job 10:15; 1:21; and Gen 2:25 (noting the similarity between ערוה and ערום), he suggests, "it may be that ערות קלן also comes from reflection on created human nature and refers to nothing more than the human's low state"; Hultgren, *Covenant*, 436. The point which Hultgren does not permit of the Hodayot, as shall be seen below, is precisely that they can both reflect on "created human nature" and simultaneously look down on the inherent properties of impurity that attach to it. Hultgren also fails to reflect on the collective impact of these terms in settings where they are piled one upon the other; cf. v 30–33, for instance. Moreover, he does not offer an alternative interpretation to the critical text in xx 27–28; see below.

58 For *Niedrigkeitsdoxologie* as a response to heavenly exaltation, cf. now Harkins, "Reading the Qumran Hodayot," 40; eadem, "A New Proposal," 111–12. Chazon juxtaposes these elements but with a slightly different emphasis; statements of lowliness "enhance[s] the sense of elevation": "Lowly to Lofty," 4.

59 Becker, *Das Heil Gottes*, 135–36.

und ihrer Güte, durch die Gott sich als gerecht erweist, wird bekannt.”⁶⁰ This generalization of human lowliness results in statements akin to the sweeping denials of true human righteousness found in texts such as Ps 143:2 and Eccl 7:20; but those texts have little else in common with the Lowliness Doxologies form-critically conceived. In fact, the Lowliness Doxologies are often more closely aligned in terms of form and content neither with these isolated statements nor with the *Gerichtsdoxologien*, but rather with the anthropological variants of the biblical “self-abasement” and “insult” formulas. George W. Coats studied these; he summarizes the syntactic characteristics as comprising

two principal structural elements, an introductory question constructed as a noun clause with interrogative particle *מָה* or *מִי* and pronoun, name, or noun, and a following assertion, introduced by *כִּי*, *אֲשֶׁר*, or a *waw* consecutive imperfect and constructed around a verbal form. The second element regularly picks up the object of the first element as the subject or object of the verb or the object of a preposition.⁶¹

The formula performs a consistent semantic function: “It poses a question in element *a*, then abases the noun or pronoun subject by an implied answer to the question. On the basis of the implied answer, the verb in element *b* is negated.”⁶² One could paraphrase, on the model of Ps 8:5 (E: 4), which through Job, stands behind the *Niedrigkeitsdoxologien*: “What is a mortal that you should care for him? You should not, for he is insignificant.” This form is much better suited to the dehistoricized and thoroughly anthropological nature of the Hodayot’s concerns. Perhaps we can call these statements in which the Doxologies of Lowliness take part the “anthropological interrogatives.”⁶³

No agreement exists concerning how these statements are to be understood. Becker, for instance, struggled to reconcile the Doxologies’ generalization of human nullity and their celebration of God’s creative act and justice. For Becker, human sin and the order of God’s creation stand juxtaposed in

60 Ibid., 139. Cf. also Kuhn, *Enderwartung*, 27.

61 George W. Coats, “Self-Abasement and Insult Formulas,” *JBL* 89 (1970): 14–26, here 26. The following texts were cited by Coats to illustrate the formula and its variations: Gen 31:36; 37:26; Exod 3:11; 5:2; 16:7, 8; Num 16:11; Judg 9:28, 38; 1 Sam 17:26; 25:10; 2 Sam 7:18; 9:8; 18:18; 1 Kgs 18:9; 2 Kgs 8:13; Isa 51:12; Ps 8:5; 144:3; Job 3:12; 6:11; 7:17; 15:14; 21:15; 1 Chron 17:16; 29:14; 2 Chron 2:6. Coats also finds the structure in the Lachish and Amarna letters.

62 Ibid., 26.

63 Cf. also 4Q301 4 3; 5 3; Sir 18:8; 4 Ezra 8:34; 2 Bar. 48:14–17. Often elements of the complete formula are only implied, but cf. 1QH^a VII 34–35; XV 35–36; XVIII 5–7; XXV 35–36.

unexplained antithesis. However, he deduces a sort of explanation in the antithetical structure of the *Niedrigkeitsdoxologien*: “Die Gewaltigkeit der Schöpfung offenbart dem Menschen, dass er Staub ist. Zeigte sie ferner, dass Gott in ihr sich als Gerechter erweist, so muss in Antithese dazu die Nichtigkeit des Menschen Aufweis seiner Sündenverfallenheit sein.”⁶⁴ On the one hand, this antithetic structure is thought to exonerate God, who created all things well, and on the other, to place the responsibility for iniquity on humankind itself.⁶⁵ But this is not entirely satisfactory, and Becker seems to have been influenced by the generic distinction that is evident, for instance, in col. IX between the Creation Psalm proper, and the worshiper’s response in the form of a Doxology of Lowliness. The solution fails if the sentiments the Doxologies express are more widespread in the Hodayot than the form itself (as I have already indicated), and particularly, if the Doxologies themselves speak of humanity as part of God’s creative act.

The latter point is affirmed by Lichtenberger.⁶⁶ He pointed to the use of the rare word קרץ in line 27 of 1QH^a XX, which has been restored on the basis of Job 33:6 (מִחֶמֶר קִרְצָתִי גִם־אֲנִי, “I too was formed from a piece of clay”) and is confirmed by a similar use in a few other Qumran texts (1QH^a XVIII 6; 1QS XI 22; 4Q501 28+29 4). The full statement reads, “from dust [you] took [me, and from clay] I was [n]ipped (ק[ו]רצתי) as a source of pollution and shameful dishonour (למקור נדה וערות קלון)” (1QH^a XX 27–28). The use of the *lamed* with this verb points to the goal or purpose of the act of forming.⁶⁷ God created the psalmist to be a “source of pollution and shameful dishonour.” Thus, contra Becker, in the Hodayot there is no fundamental antithesis between God’s creation and human nature. 1QHodayot^a XX 27–28 makes explicit the startling implication a reader may have already drawn from the ubiquitous presence of terms drawn from the creation of humankind in contexts of self-abasement and insult,

64 Becker, *Das Heil Gottes*, 109–14.

65 Human culpability for individual acts of sin appears to be assumed in the Hodayot; however, statements concerning human iniquity stand alongside others which connect nothingness, impurity, and sin to the physical makeup of humanity itself. Becker himself recognized this when he observed that, uniquely, in comparison with biblical texts, the Lowliness Doxologies make “flesh”/בשר the locus of sin (cf. 1QS XI 9–15; 1QH^a XII 30–31). Thus, the magnitude of God’s creation may explain a sense of human insignificance, but, in theses psalms, it does not lead, via God’s righteousness, to human iniquity; in fact, the magnitude of creation does not elicit the psalmists’ anthropological abasement so much as does the experience of election.

66 Lichtenberger, *Menschenbild*, 88–90; cf., too, Newsom, “Moral Self,” 21, 23–24.

67 Cf. the “lamed of purpose” in Bruce K. Waltke and Michael Patrick O’Connor, *An Introduction to Biblical Hebrew Syntax* (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1990), 209.

namely, that part of God's mysterious plan includes the creation of mortals for whom sinfulness and impurity are innate to their physiology.

The Lowliness Doxologies emerge in part from the worshiper's view of human nature as a product of God's creation. While human nature may appear insignificant on a purely physical level in the view of the psalmists, the critical contrast is not between humankind and the rest of the created world *per se*. Rather, it is between human nature and God's electing favour demonstrated in the possession of secret knowledge and participation in the communion of heavenly beings. With the doxologies, the psalmists marvel that one whom God created so lowly could be elected to a destiny so extraordinary. In fact, the contrast is even deeper, for in contradistinction from the eighth biblical psalm, in the most radical statements there runs a deep *antithesis* between created human nature and the destiny God intends for the elect.

The Man of Dust

In the Hodayot, the reader is most often, but not exclusively, reminded of those primal humanity traditions that describe the creation of humankind from terrestrial materials; the gesture to such traditions occurs in statements involving some degree of self-predication, and, as with all scriptural inter-texts in the Hodayot, is only rarely direct and predominately by allusion. Yet not all who read these texts find or stress allusions to the Genesis accounts of creation—the nexus through which such traditions begin to be read in Second Temple times. Julie Hughes cautions that, apart from the presence of additional elements signaling a particular text, a phrase such as *יצר החמר ומגבל המים* (“creature of clay, kneaded with water”) may not be an allusion to Gen 2, despite its possible origin there, but rather merely idiomatic for human sinfulness.⁶⁸ However, if it is found that a large number of Hodayot show concern with the creation of humanity *per se*, and if one regularly finds the presence of additional intertextual cues to related tradition clusters, then a strong presupposition can be made in favour of (un)conscious engagement with such traditions even in the periodic absence of more technical criteria for identifying them.⁶⁹

68 Citing Job 10:9; 33:6; Isa 29:16, and Isa 41:25, she remarks, “such multiple use of a phrase is more easily explained as the use of an idiom”; she does, however, admit of an allusion to Gen 2–3 in col. xx 27–31; Hughes, *Allusions and Exegesis*, 46–47.

69 John Elwolde's study of interrogatives in the Hodayot also adopts the perspective that such texts are preoccupied by anthropological “abasement” and “thingness” and that borrowings from traditions of the creation of Adam allow the speaker to become “every-man”; “Interrogatives in the Hodayot: Some Preliminary Observations,” in *Hamlet on a*

Still, Hughes' point is well-taken, and this study is cautious about relating every reference to *adam* or *yetzer* to the biblical myths.⁷⁰

A more direct challenge to reading the Hodayot's anthropology in the light of traditions of creation is made by Stephen Hultgren. To be sure, Hultgren recognizes the dependence of the Hodayot on that pessimistic strain of the wisdom tradition (primarily represented by the book of Job) that stresses the lowly nature of the created human condition.⁷¹ Yet the more extreme sentiments related to human spiritual perversity and impurity he reads in the light of the Enochic tradition of the fall of the watchers, which is evident both outside the Hodayot, in texts closely related to its ideology (1 En. 15:8–16:3; Jub. 7:20–33; 11:4; 4Q444 I 8; 4Q511 48, 49+51 2–3), and within (col. xxiv, especially).⁷² He understands, in particular, the term “fount of impurity” (מקור הנדה) and, possibly, “spirit of error” (רוח התועה) and “depraved spirit” (רוח נעוה) as reflecting the polluting effect of the fall of the angels and the “spirits of bastards” (רוחי ממזרים) on humankind.⁷³ Not cited by Hultgren is col. xxiv of the reconstructed 1QH^a. In the context of judgement “for the everlasting angels,” the column describes the “mysteries of transgression in order that flesh (בשר) be changed through [their] guilt” (ll. 8–10) and speaks of “the bastards” who act “wickedly with flesh” (l. 26). Nevertheless, even here where traces of the Enochic myth are most distinct and anthropologically relevant the key terms under discussion (besides “flesh”) are absent and statements bearing on human nature do not appear to operate on the same level of fundamental or archetypal anthropology as others that shall be encountered in this chapter. Moreover, the “change” effected on human flesh occurs in relation to the “everlasting angels” (cf. l. 8) and likely refers to the production of the “giants”—or the “bastards,” as it were; the רוחי ממזרים who act wickedly with flesh refers, as in the myth (1 En. 15:8–16:3), to the spirits of the mutant giants who presently harass the elect, the term “flesh” being singled out because it is already a suitable residence—especially the innards/bowels (תבמים)—for deleterious spiritual influences (cf. col. iv 13–20, 35–37; 1QS iv 20; 4Q444 I 2–4; 4Q511

Hill: Semitic and Greek Studies Presented to Professor T. Muraoka on the Occasion of His Sixty-Fifth Birthday, OLA 118 (Leuven: Peeters, 2003), 129–51.

70 Gary Anderson's survey “Adam” in *EDSS*, 7–9, does not reference the Hodayot at all.

71 Hultgren, *Covenant*, 434–36.

72 Although col. xxiv is unique in the Hodayot for its mention of “the spirits of the bastards,” vestiges of the Enochic watchers myth and various other Enochic elements are present elsewhere. Harkins in particular has drawn our attention to these; cf. Chapter 1, “Issues of Anthropogony in the Hodayot.”

73 Hultgren, *Covenant*, 436–37.

48, 49+51 3–4).⁷⁴ Even in these statements, however, the Enochic myth does not operate as the basis from which to describe human creatureliness *per se*; there is nothing equivalent here to describing the self as a “perverted spirit” or “fashioned as a source of impurity.” The Enochic myth doubtless contributes to the Hodayot’s (and the TST’s) depiction of the human being as spiritually conflicted, but the Hodayot move the origin of this condition to the moment of creation, which provides a more suitable framework to express the defining features of human anthropology within the intentions of a predetermined divine plan.⁷⁵ The fall of the watchers remains a momentous event in the history of the mysteries of sin, but in the Hodayot it does not effect a change in human anthropology *per se*.

That humankind has been created from dust is an almost ubiquitous feature of the Hodayot, and inasmuch as the Hodayot are concerned with anthropology, terms reflecting this tradition typically carry far more semantic weight and mythological resonance than can be attributed to the automatic expressions of idiomatic speech. The tradition is reflected in a fairly consistent manner. Often the “I” of the speaker and the “everyman” of third person descriptors merge at the same time as they draw on the primal man traditions reflected in the Genesis narrative of creation from the ground.⁷⁶ The blending of identities is readily illustrated in col. XVIII:

[4] No one can contemplate [your] wis[dom], ⁵ and on your [secret] mysteries no one can gaze. What, then, is אדם—he is only אדמה, ⁶ pinched

74 Cf. Meyer, “תכמים,” in *Theologisches Wörterbuch zu den Qumrantexten*, ed. Heinz-Josef Fabry and Ulrich Dahmen, vol. 3 (Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, forthcoming).

75 Although the Enochic theodicy is capable of functioning independently of, and even supplanting, one based on the creation stories, it apparently did neither such thing, at least in documents most closely allied with the sectarian movement behind the scrolls. Rather, as we shall see, in the Hodayot (and the Community Rule) the tendency is toward a conflation wherein later conditions, such as those represented in the Enochic myth, are contained or prepared for in the creation of humankind, a logical outworking (a “perfection”) of the predestinational framework of the more distinctively sectarian scrolls. One can already see this at work in CD II 14–III 12, where the fall of the angels has virtually no anthropological impact and the root of evil, the יצר אשמה ועני זנות II 16, is a prior innate condition affecting angels and humans equally. In the Enochic tradition, the emphasis appears reversed, with the fall of the watchers myth carrying greater anthropological ramifications than the creation traditions proper; cf. Annette Yoshiko Reed, *Fallen Angels and the History of Judaism and Christianity: The Reception of Enochic Literature* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005), 84–121.

76 Cf. Elwolde, “Interrogatives,” 132, 134, 143.

off c[lay] (ח[מר] קורץ), whose return is to dust (ולעפר תשובתו)—that you have given him insight into wonders such as these, and that the secret counsel of [your] tru[th] ⁷ you have made known to him? As for me, dust and ashes (ואני עפר ואפר), what can I devise unless you desire it, and what can I plan for myself ⁸ without your will? . . . How can I have insight unless you have formed it ⁹ for me? What can I say unless you open my mouth?

The move from “primal man” (ll. 5–7) to *this* “man” (l. 8) is evident, although even the primal man was not “everyman” in the strict sense, since the rhetorical point was to ask how *some* in the category primal man might be privy to the divine mysteries for the cosmos (ll. 6–7). The psalmist makes good on the ambiguity of the Hebrew הָאָדָם in Gen 2:7 (Adam or “the human”?) as well as making explicit the wordplay implied in the *adam*’s formation from הָאָדָמָה (l. 5). In a borrowing from Job 33:6 (מִחֶמֶר קִרְצָתִי), the creation from dust (עפר, also Gen 2:7) blends into the picture of working with clay. And, finally, the explication of the primal man’s mortality in Gen 3:19 is echoed in the “return” (שוב) to dust (ll. 5–6). When the psalmist turns to the first person (ll. 7–9), a self-description is employed that merges the “I” with *adam* by again referencing the earthy composition of the primal human. (Both Job and Abraham used the same term of self-deprecation, “dust and ashes,” in order to contrast human finitude implicitly with God; Job 42:6; Gen 18:27; cf. also Job 30:19.) The identification of the “I” with *adam* is even more complete in col. xx 27 as the psalmist remarks, “As for me, from dust [you] took [me] (לָקַחְתָּנִי).” Such examples are sufficient to show that the anthropological sentiments of the psalms, including highly formulaic ones, often grapple with the tradition of the creation of *adam* from the earth; they do so because, even when speaking in the first person, it is human nature itself that is their concern.

The *adam*-of-dust tradition highlights the natural epistemic and (other) physiological shortcomings of the speaker. Human creation from dust signifies a lack of the capacity to know. In col. xviii cited above, the creatureliness of the psalmist provokes a sense of unworthiness (“What, then, is *adam*,” ll. 5–6) but also poses an obstacle to knowledge (“How can I have insight?” ll. 8–9); knowledge must come from without and despite himself. The same problem is posed and resolved somewhat more tantalizingly in cols. v and vi, in the context of a psalm that is widely recognized to depend on 4QInstruction.⁷⁷

(30) [But how i]s a spirit of flesh (רוח בשר) to understand ³¹ all these things and to discern *bs* [] great? What is one born of woman amid all your

77 Cf. Rey, *4QInstruction*, 22–28; Goff, “Reading Wisdom”; Tigchelaar, *To Increase Learning*, 194–207.

[gre]at fearful acts? He is ³² a thing constructed of dust and (a creature) kneaded with water. Sin[ful gui]lt is his foundation, obscene shame, and a so[urce of im]purity. And a perverted spirit rules ³³ him (ורוח נעוה משלה בו). If he acts wickedly, he will become[a sign for]ever and a portent for dis[ta]nt generations of flesh. Only through your goodness ³⁴ can a person be righteous, and by [your] abundant mer[cy] By your splendour you glorify him, and you give [him] dominion [with] abundant delights together with eternal ³⁵ peace for long life. For [and] your word will not turn back. And I, your servant, know ³⁶ by means of the spirit that you have given me [ידעתי ברוח נתתה בי). (1QH^a v)

In lines 30–31 the psalmist wonders how a “spirit of flesh” can know “these things,” i.e., God’s mysterious plan for creation, which had just been described in the course of ll. 15–30. There the psalmist had already apparently identified with the “spirit of flesh” (l. 15) and had explained that “in your wonderful mysteries [you] have instructed [me for the s]ake of your glory” (l. 18). But now the epistemic dilemma emerges: How can a spirit of flesh understand? Before answering the question, its rationale is first given. The “spirit of flesh” is merely one “born of a woman.” The ensuing description of the compromised ontological status of this creature draws from the account of *adam*’s creation in Gen 2 (ll. 31–33, see below); this being is totally dependent upon God for righteousness (ll. 33–34) and for perfection (ll. 34–35, see below). This creature is unfit and unable by nature to grasp the divine plan. The rationale for the question being given, the answer now comes: “I know by means of the spirit that you have given me []” (ll. 35–36). The obtuseness of the “spirit of flesh” is overcome by a gift of spirit. The connection between spirit and knowledge is made again later in the same psalm: “And as for me, I know from the understanding that comes from you (מבינתך) that through your goodwill toward a p[er]son you mul[ti]ply (הרב[יתה]) his portion] in your holy spirit (ברוח קודשך). Thus you draw him closer to your understanding (תגישנו לבינתך)” (vI 23–24). The Joban interloper, Elihu, alluding to the tradition recorded in Gen 2:7, had asserted, “But truly it is the spirit in a mortal, the breath (נשמה) of the Almighty, that makes for understanding” (Job 32:8), but our psalmist appears to have little confidence in the epistemic efficacy of the creaturely ontology established in Gen 2–3.

The term “spirit of flesh”⁷⁸ occurs elsewhere in the *Hodayot* only in col. iv, where it appears as part of a supplication for strength to withstand the dominion of spirits which inhabit the worshiper (“for your servant is a spirit of flesh,”

78 On this term, cf. Frey, “The Notion of ‘Flesh’ in 4QInstruction and the Background of Pauline Usage”; Rey, *4QInstruction*, 299–303; Tigchelaar, *To Increase Learning*, 186–88; and now with greater emphasis on the negative connotations of the term, idem, “בשר,”

ll. 35–37); a similar association between “spirit of flesh” and enslavement to evil spirits is probably made in the present psalm (“a perverted spirit rules him,” v 32–33). Yet here the term primarily connotes a being whose “fleshli-ness” inhibits understanding,⁷⁹ which very much coheres with the appearance of the term in 4QInstruction, 4Q417 1 i 14–18, where revealed knowledge⁸⁰ is accessible to “a people of spirit” (עַם רוּחַ) who is “fashioned after the pattern of the holy ones,” but withheld from “a spirit of flesh” (רוּחַ בֶּשֶׁר), which “did not know the difference between good and evil,” the two kinds being contrasted by allusion to Gen 1:26–27 and Gen 2–3, respectively.⁸¹ Similarly in the present text, the spirit of flesh is identified with the *adam* of Gen 2–3, while an enlightenment by spirit effects a transformation more in line with what is predicated in the tradition of the image of God in Gen 1:26–27 (ll. 34–35; see below). Both

in *Theologisches Wörterbuch zu den Qumrantexten*, ed. Heinz-Josef Fabry and Ulrich Dahmen (Stuttgart: Kolhammer, 2010), 1:537–48.

- 79 The same implication is found elsewhere where comparable terms are employed, e.g., 1QH^a VIII 18–21; IX 24–25; XII 32–33; XIX 15.
- 80 Both texts even refer to a vision: 4Q417 1 i 16 and 1QH^a VI 18.
- 81 So far as I am aware John Collins was first to suggest that Gen 1–3 provides the framework for this dualistic construal of humanity; cf. “In the Likeness of the Holy Ones: The Creation of Humankind in a Wisdom Text from Qumran,” in *Provo International Conference on the Dead Sea Scrolls*, ed. Donald W. Parry and Eugene Ulrich, STDJ 30 (Leiden: Brill, 1999), 609–18; idem, “Interpretations of the Creation of Humanity in the Dead Sea Scrolls,” in *Biblical Interpretation at Qumran*, ed. Matthias Henze (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2005), 36–39. The major alternative is advocated by Armin Lange, who sees the text making reference in ll. 15 and 16 to the time of the patriarchs Seth and Enosh. But the occurrence of the term “sons of Seth” (בְּנֵי שֵׁת, l. 15) in other Qumran texts (Jub. 22:12; 1QM XI 6; CD VII 21; and 4Q175 13) shows that it alludes to Num 24:17. As such it is a cipher for the enemies of the elect, rather than a reference to the time of the patriarch and his progeny. This makes it extremely difficult to read אָנוֹשׁ (l. 16) as a reference to the patriarch, Enosh, rather than “humankind.” Cf. Lange, “Wisdom and Predestination in the Dead Sea Scrolls,” 341–43; idem, *Weisheit und Prädestination*. Lange’s interpretation is adopted by Frey, “Flesh and Spirit,” 397–99. For an alternative interpretation, cf. also Eibert J. C. Tigchelaar, “‘Spiritual People,’ ‘Fleshly Spirit,’ and ‘Vision of Meditation’: Reflections on 4QInstruction and 1 Corinthians,” in *Echoes from the Caves: Qumran and the New Testament*, ed. Florentino Martínez, STDJ 85 (Leiden: Brill, 2009), 103–18. With different nuances of interpretation, the framework suggested by Collins is favoured by many; cf., e.g., John Kampen, *Wisdom Literature*, ECDSS (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2011), 100–101; Rey, *4QInstruction*, 277–306; Matthew J. Goff, *Discerning Wisdom: The Sapiential Literature of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, VTSup 116 (Leiden: Brill, 2007), 29–36; Benjamin G. Wold, *Women, Men and Angels: The Qumran Wisdom Document Musar leMevin and Its Allusions to Genesis Creation Traditions*, WUNT 201 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2005), 124–48, including an extensive survey of interpretations.

in 4QInstruction and 1QH^a v, the *adamic* (“spirit of”) flesh connotes ignorance, while “spirit” connotes knowledge; however, while in 4QInstruction the “spirit of flesh” designates a category of humanity opposed to God, from which the elect are distinguished,⁸² in the Hodayot it describes the depraved human condition in general, with which the psalmist identifies, testifying to the Hodayot’s more radical anthropology.⁸³

The dust-man is not only inherently deaf and dumb but also structurally and morally compromised. This is already apparent in col. v 32–33, above, but the created nature of this condition is most clearly stated in col. xx:

[27] As for me, from dust [you] took [me (לקח[תני]) and from clay] I was [n]ipped (ק[ורצתי])²⁸ as a source of pollution and shameful dishonour (למקור נדה וערות קלון), a heap of dust and a thing kneaded [with water (מקוי עפר ומגבלן במים), a council of magg]ots, a dwelling of²⁹ darkness. And there is a return (ותשובת) to dust for the creature of clay (ליצר חמר) at the time of [your] anger [] dust returns (י[שוב])³⁰ to that from which it was taken (לקח). What can dust and ashes reply [concerning your judgement? And how] can it understand³¹ its [d]eeds?

In this remarkable text the story of Adam has become that of the speaker (ll. 27–28, first person, earlier = the *Maskil*, ll. 14–15), yet not the speaker as a particular individual, but rather (in the third person now) a “creature of clay” (ll. 29–31). One can hear the story of Adam in the verbs of creation (l. 27 + the nominal יצר in l. 29), the reference to dust kneaded with water (l. 28), and the decree of mortality—the return to dust (ll. 29–30). The confrontation between God and Adam (and Eve) echoes through the psalmist’s disavowal of any power or words with which to stand before God’s judgement (ll. 30–31; also ll. 33–39).⁸⁴ The terms reflecting sexual impurity (l. 28), here generalized of the human condition, resonate with the shame Adam and Eve feel before God in their naked creatureliness (עירם, Gen 3:8, 10, 11).

82 Cf. 4Q416 1 12 (=4Q418 2, 2a-c, 4 with different verb); 4Q417 1 i 17; 4Q418 81 2; and once reconstructed from 4Q416 2 ii 2–3; 4Q417 2 ii 4; and 4Q419 8 ii 7.

83 Cf. Rey, *4QInstruction*, 301, “Contrairement aux Hymns, ou le syntagme désignait l’humanité en général, l’expression a ici un caractère fortement négatif et désigne un catégorie opposée à Dieu.” This description may fail to capture the negative valence of the phrase in the Hodayot, but it accurately defines the difference in reference the phrase has in relation to both works.

84 Concerning 1QH^a 1X 25, “terrified by righteous judgements” (ונבעתה במשפטי צדק), John Elwode, “Interrogatives,” 132, suggests an “allusion to Adam’s fear of God’s discovery of their disobedience.” An allusion is even clearer here.

Not only does the psalmist allow the creation of Adam to reflect the creation of everyman—a natural extension of the myth itself—but he also permits the condition of everyman to be reflected in the creation of Adam. The human predicament is coextensive with human creation. The *lamed* of l. 28 points to the intended outcome of the verbs of creation that precede it. Thus the characterization of the human condition as a source of pollution, shameful dishonour, and a heap of dust expresses the product of divine creative-intentionality. This remarkable statement makes explicit a connection that was only implied in the stringing together of epithets in col. v 31–33, above, where terms relating to creation from dust (יצר חמר, etc.) were applied to the human being in parallel with those signifying human procreation (ילוד אשה, v 31; XXI 2; XXIII 13–14; cf., too, XII 30–31) and sinful impurity (מקור נדה, ערות קלן, as here), overlooking any distinction that might be made between pre- and post-lapsarian humanity. Human mortality (Gen 3:19) is comprehended in human creation (Gen 2:7)—it is both an effect of creation (hence, “a council of maggots, a dwelling of darkness,” xx 27–28) and of punitive judgement (“anger,” l. 29). The negative valence of the death-bringing *yetzer*, as it appears in Gen 6:5 and 8:21, is possibly read back into the product of God’s work of “forming” in Gen 2:7 (l. 29). The “history” of Adam and Eve and their descendants is contained within their creation.

If the psalmist can look forward to allow the creation of Adam to cohere with what humanity becomes, he can also look backward to read into the same creation the earlier history of the earth from which Adam was taken. A handful of texts associate Adam’s constituent parts with the materials of chaos: XXI 30 (of the same psalm), [מגב] ל און ואפס (“[a knead]ing of nought and nothingness”); xv 35, ומה הוא איש תהו ובעל הבל (“what is a person of nothingness and a possessor of vanity”);⁸⁵ and possibly III 29, תהו ויצר חמר (“formlessness⁸⁶ and

85 The juxtaposition of the nouns תהו and הבל is most closely paralleled in Isa 49:4a, where they appear not as a statement concerning human ontology *per se* but as a lament for the insubstantiality of the speaker’s efforts (וְאֲנִי אֲמַרְתִּי לְרִיק יִנְעַמְתִּי לְתַהוֹ וְהִבֵּל בְּחַי כְּלִיתִי). That the juxtaposition may be inspired by this context is suggested by the additional emphasis in the psalm on the speaker’s unmerited privilege before God (ומי יצדק לפניכה בהשפטו), matching 49:4b (אֲבָכֵן מִשְׁפָּטִי אֶת־יְהוָה וּפְעֻלָּתִי אֶת־אֱלֹהִי). The terms, however, when made statements of ontology, clearly evoke traditions of the creation of the world and humanity (cf. Gen 1:2; 4:2ff.; Ps 144:4; Job 7:16).

86 Where Qimron, *Hebrew Writings*, 1:106, makes out רוח תהו “a spirit of formlessness,” Stegemann reconstructed only a final *mem* + תהו. There are only a few minute traces of letters at this point.

a creature of cla[y]).⁸⁷ Thus the qualities of the earth in Gen 1:2, its formlessness, emptiness, and dark waters, are transposed into the creation of Adam from the moistened earth in Gen 2:6–7.

The above texts are typical of the Hodayot: traditions drawn from the creation of Adam in Gen 2 are presented as an obstacle to the reception of the privileges involved in election. In Israel's psalms the motif of *adam's* dust functions mostly as grounds to elicit divine pity; similarly, it might highlight the delimited span of meaningful human service to God, as when the psalmist laments, "What profit is there in my death, if I go down to the Pit? Will the dust praise you? Will it tell of your faithfulness?" (Ps 30:10 [E: 9]).⁸⁸ While this psalmist could only imagine an extension of mortal life, the sectarian was assured of an immortal existence. Against such an exalted horizon it is not surprising that the tradition of the dust-man functions rhetorically less as grounds for pity than the illustration of an opposite or the creation of a contradiction. Even the giving of breath (Gen 2:7b) is either (nearly) entirely muted⁸⁹ or replaced—at

87 Cf. 4Q511 28+29 4, לִי, קוֹרְצֵתִי וּמִחוּשָׁךְ מִגֵּב [חֹמֶר], "[from clay] I am nipped, and from darkness is [my] mixtu[re]." "Chaos" (בְּשׁוּבָךְ מִתּוֹהוּ) is also mentioned in 1QH^a 1X 2 (=frg. 24), at the beginning of the "Creation Hymn," according to the reconstruction of DJD XL, but unfortunately little can be made of it.

88 Cf., too, Ps 90:3; 103:14; 104:29; also Eccl 3:20; 12:7.

89 One possible exception is 1X 29–30: "You yourself created breath for the tongue" (אַתָּה בִּלְשׁוֹן רֹחַ בְּרַאתָהּ רוּחַ בְּלִשְׁוֹן), a statement later correlated to making proclamation and offering praise (ll. 31–33); however, there is little indication that the reader is to think of Gen 2:7 (the vocabulary differs entirely), and in any case, the positive function attributed to this creative act (proclamation and praise) requires first the intervention of God (ll. 33–35). It is admittedly difficult to determine the significance of another expression in the Hodayot, namely, that which uses the verb יָצַר with רוּחַ (cf. VII 35 [w. 34]; 1X 17; XII 32; XVIII 24) to speak of the spirit formed by God. It is to be noted that the verb is commonly used of God's various creative activities and can be used where Gen 1–2 uses בָּרָא (e.g., Isa 45:7, 18; Amos 4:13; Jer 1:5; but cf. Zech 12:1, וַיֵּצֶר רוּחַ אָדָם בְּקִרְבּוֹ). This expression also occurs in col. IX, where in the midst of the description of God's fashioning the heavens and their inhabitants as well as the earth and its inhabitants, the words are preserved, "] for the spirit of *adam* that you fashioned (לְרוּחַ אָדָם אֲשֶׁר יָצַרְתָּ) in the world for all the days of eternity"; the possibility of an allusion to Gen 2:7 (in addition to Zech 12:1) is weakened by the statement that introduces this section, "You formed every spirit" (יָצַרְתָּה כָּל רוּחַ), which introduces both the spirits of the heavens and then, in transition, the spirit of *adam*. Elsewhere, 1QH^a VII 34–35 states, "But what is flesh that it should have insight into [these things? And] how is [a creat]ure of dust able to direct its steps? *vacat* You yourself have formed the spirit (אַתָּה יָצַרְתָּה רוּחַ) and determined its activity [from of old]. And from you (comes) the way of every living being"; this may reflect a deliberate pairing of Gen 2:7a and b but it is extremely difficult to tell; in any case the point would

best by the “spirit of flesh”⁹⁰ and at worst, the “perverted spirit.”⁹¹ Thus, the semantic value of the creation of Adam tradition drawn from Gen 2 is entirely negative.⁹² The peculiar force of this observation should not be missed: It is the *creation* of Adam, into which the subsequent story of Adam and his progeny is subsumed, that carries this negative semantic value—not merely what this *adam* becomes in distinction to its creation. This application of the creation story of Gen 2, startling as it may be, may reflect a sensitivity to several elements of the biblical narrative, including the agreement of the punitive decree of mortality with the creation of Adam from perishable materials; that Adam and Eve’s shame before God centres on their creatureliness; the restrictions on knowledge, which is first prohibited and then of an ambiguous nature; the readiness (or *yetzer*) with which the couple disobeyed God’s command; and finally the creation of the *adam* from an earth which has an ambiguous history with the elements of chaos.

simply be to stress that humans, righteous or wicked, are completely under the predeterministic agency of God. The same point is made in col. XII 32–33: “The way of humanity (ברוח יצר אל לו), in order to perfect a way for the sons of *adam* (לבני אדם).” Likewise, col. XVIII 24 has the speaker affirm, “I wait hopefully, for you yourself have formed the spi[rit of your servant, and according to]your [wil] you have determined me”; in context this is an affirmation of the speaker’s election, the fact that God has not made him depend on what is “flesh” (ll. 24–25, cf. Jer 17:5), and it may reflect the Isaianic use of the verb in context of the servant songs (Isa 43:21; 44:2, 21, 24; 49:5; cf., too, Jer 1:5). In fact, the *lack* of the use of the word רוח in Gen 2:7b may have served (despite Gen 6:3, 17; 7:15, 22) as a further sign of the natural spiritual depravity of the *adam*-of-dust; alternatively, if one were to press the Hodayot’s attenuated reflection of the Two Spirits doctrine, then there might be found in Gen 2:7b not indications of depravity but glimmers of a contrasting spiritual orientation. In view of the difficulty of these attempts to relate these texts to Gen 2:7, the absence of the more distinctive elements of that verse (contrast 4Q504 8 *recto* 5), and the widespread generic use of יצר to describe God’s creation of just about any aspect of the world and cosmos, it seems likely that most of these cases are merely idiomatic.

90 As suggested by Matthew J. Goff, *The Worldly and Heavenly Wisdom of 4QInstruction*, STDJ 50 (Leiden: Brill, 2003), 98.

91 As suggested by Levison, *Filled*, 203, referring to 1QH^a XI 22 (cf., too, VIII 18, “a perverted spirit has ruled over a vessel of dust”).

92 Ibid., 202–5: “nearly without exception . . . the author of many of the hymns that were preserved in Judaean caves takes the language of creation in Gen 2:7 as more than a muted harbinger of physical death; inbreathing, dust, and earth become instead the ingredients of despair” (202).

Impurity and Sin: Refracting the Psalms and Job

In their scriptures, the sectarians would have encountered implicitly at least two categories, ritual and moral impurity.⁹³ The bulk of the purity regulations therein are concerned with ritual purity, and relevant to human participation in or proximity to the Israelite cult. The Holiness Code of Lev 17–27 is unique in the emphasis it applies to social practices, the language of purity referring largely to morality, and this remains the major purity concern outside of the Torah. While the two kinds of impurity are probably not to be distinguished absolutely, as representing two essentially different things, certain distinctions are fairly consistently maintained between ritual and moral impurity.⁹⁴ Ritual impurity, which primarily concerns conditions of life that are inevitable, is not in itself indicative of (culpable) sin, and moral impurity is not typically subject to the ablutions of ritual impurity (except in metaphors) until Second Temple times.

Jonathan Klawans, though not the first, is especially to be noted for making the case that such distinctions maintained in the HB concerning matters of moral and ritual purity have collapsed in the sectarian scrolls (especially 1QS, 1QH, 1QM).⁹⁵ Klawans formulates the dictum: “At Qumran, sin was considered to be ritually defiling, and ritual defilement was assumed to come about because of sin.”⁹⁶ Hannah Harrington, another prominent voice, likewise

93 This basic outline is indebted to Jonathan Klawans, *Impurity and Sin*, 3–42. Eve Levavi Feinstein would add at least a third category, “sexual pollution,” by which she means “the effects of sexual contacts that the biblical authors deem problematic, such as adultery and incest.” This category is distinct from sexual impurity as a sub-set of ritual impurity; *Sexual Pollution in the Hebrew Bible* (New York: Oxford, 2014), 3. It is the latter category which comes under consideration here.

94 Several scholars, including Feinstein, have critiqued the rigidity with which Klawans draws his distinctions, and Thomas Kazen is to be credited with spearheading a new (or renewed) awareness of the role of disgust behind all notions of contagion, including ritual impurity; Kazen, *Emotions in Biblical Law: A Cognitive Science Approach*, Hebrew Bible Monographs 36 (Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix, 2011); cf., too, Tracy Lemos, “Where there Is Dirt, Is there System? Revisiting Biblical Purity Constructions,” *JSOT* 37 (2013): 265–94; Yitzhaq Feder, “Contagion and Cognition: Bodily Experience and the Conceptualization of Pollution (ṭum’ah) in the Hebrew Bible,” *JNES* 72 (2013): 151–67.

95 For repentance and ritual defilement: 4Q512 29–32 8–9; 4Q274 1 i 1–4; on ritual impurity resulting from moral impurity: 1QS V 13–15, 20; VI 24–25; VIII 16–18; CD IX 16–23. Cf. the survey of literature in Klawans, *Impurity and Sin*, 3–42; for more focus on Qumran scholarship and the debate there, cf. idem, “Purity in the Dead Sea Scrolls,” in *The Oxford Handbook of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, ed. Timothy H. Lim and John J. Collins (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010), 384–88.

96 Klawans, *Impurity and Sin*, 88.

describes, a little more cautiously, “a blurring of the line, between the two types of impurity.” “Both,” she adds, “require ritual purification.”⁹⁷ The Hodayot are important in these studies. According to Harrington, the author “describes the human being as hopelessly depraved and inherently impure”; impurity is thus “an ontological category resulting from the human condition.”⁹⁸ The Hodayot associate this lamentable defilement directly with creation from the stuff of the earth.

The intimate association between the *adam*-of-dust motif and impurity has already been seen; the impurity of the human condition is entailed ontologically in its very creation by God. This matter-of-fact reality becomes a critical problem in the Hodayot,⁹⁹ but it remains to be seen how this association between creation from dust and innate impurity might be generated. There is evidence that it has benefitted from the equation of creation from the ground and gestation in the womb. The scriptural tradition already connects these motifs. Psalm 139:13 and 15, for instance, speak of the two acts of creation in parallel: “For it was you who formed my inward parts; you knit me together in my mother’s womb. . . . My frame was not hidden from you, when I was being made in secret, intricately woven in the depths of the earth.” An even more direct identification between the womb and the earth is achieved in Job 1:21, “Naked I came from my mother’s womb, and naked shall I return there,” and Sir 40:1, “a heavy yoke is laid on the children of Adam, from the day they come forth from their mother’s womb until the day they return to the mother of all the living” (cf. 16:30; Eccl 5:15; Gen 3:19b). As Carol Newsom remarks, “The womb of the mother becomes the metaphor for the grave, and indeed for the earth, from which one comes and to which one returns.”¹⁰⁰

It is through the metaphorical relationship of womb and earth that the psalmists are able to transfer associations of ritual-sexual impurity to the very act of creation from dust. The transference of ritual-sexual impurity from the earth directly to Adam and Eve seems to lie behind Jubilees’ presentation of the couple as needing to wait forty and eighty days, respectively, before being

97 Harrington, *The Purity Texts*, 30.

98 Ibid., 56–57.

99 Cf. Helmer Ringgren: “there is the use of sexual expressions such as ‘*erwah*, shame (lit.: nakedness, pudenda) and *niddah*, impurity (lit.: menstrual blood). They have lost their original literal meanings, but they give an impression of the deepest abhorrence of the impurity of human nature”; *The Faith of Qumran: Theology of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1963), 97. I, however, do not think they have lost their original meanings so much as they have been transformed, given a new significance which in fact relies on one’s awareness of the literal referent.

100 Carol A. Newsom, *Job*, NIB 4 (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1996), 352.

brought into the temple-garden, as suggested by Harrington. The text would seem to apply the Levitical term for purification after childbirth to children (here, Adam and Eve) as well as to the mother (cf. Lev 12:4–5; Jub. 3:8–14; also 4Q265 7 11–17).¹⁰¹ The homology of earth and womb makes this comprehensible. Its operation in the Hodayot is confirmed by the sexual terms used to belittle the earthen human being.

[27] As for me, from dust [you] took [me (לקח[תני]) and from clay] I was [n]ipped (ק[ורצתי])²⁸ as a source of pollution and shameful dishonour (למקור נדה וערות קלון), a heap of dust and a thing kneaded [with water] (מקוי עפר ומגבל[במים]), a council of maggots (סוד רמ[ה]), a dwelling of²⁹ darkness (ומדור חושך). (1QH^a xx)

Being “nipped from clay as a source of (sexual) pollution and shameful dishonor (or nakedness)” relates creation from the earth directly to impurity. Two further texts offer variations on this theme:

[31] What is one born of woman (ילוד אשה) amid all your [gre]at fearful acts? He is³² a thing constructed of dust and (a creature) kneaded with water. Sin[ful gui]lt is his foundation (א[שמה וחט]אה סודו), obscene shame (ערות קלון), and a so[urce of im]purity (ומ[קור הנ]דה). And a perverted spirit (ורוח נעוה) rules³³ him. (1QH^a v)

[23] Yet I am a creature of clay and a thing kneaded with water,²⁴ a foundation of shame (סוד הערוה) and a well of impurity (ומקור הנדה), a furnace of iniquity (בור העוון), and a structure of sin (ומבנה החטאה), a spirit of error (רוח התועה), and a perverted being (ונעוה), without²⁵ understanding, and terrified by righteous judgements. (1QH^a ix)

Here creation from the earth timelessly comprehends the normal sexual conditions of being human, but negatively construed. Terms originally signifying (female) ritual impurity (נדה) and especially apropos of human sexuality (קלון, ערות) or suggestive thereof (מקור הנדה, בור העוון) are here used to convey a deep moral disgust for created human nature.¹⁰² Their direct juxtaposition

¹⁰¹ Harrington, *The Purity Texts*, 62.

¹⁰² Cf. n. 57 for the sexual connotations of several of these terms. For בור as female pudenda, cf. the wordplay (crucible/womb) in col. xi 8–14, and cf., too, m. Šabb. 140b. John Levison, *Filled*, 204 n. 4, suggests that מבנה החטאה (ix 24) “may comprise an allusion to the creation—building—of woman in Gen 2:22.” Wernberg-Møller took the phrase מגבל

to terms conveying innate corruption (אשמה וחטאה סודו, מדור חושך, סוד רמה), רוח נעוה/התועה, מבנה החטאה, בור העוון suggests that impurity and sinful corruption have similar symbolic significance.¹⁰³ Innate impurity—conveyed in creation—is not a passing, naked fact, but a state pregnant with negative connotations.

מים (ה/ב) (1QH^a v 32; IX 23; XI 25; and XX 28 [reconstructed]; cf., too, XXI 30; 1QS XI 21; and 4Q511 28+29 4) in reference to human conception (מים=semen virile), and yet the parallelism and use of מגבל in construct with other terms in like contexts strongly suggest it (at least, also) reflects the context of Gen 2:6–7; cf. P. Wernberg-Møller, *The Manual of Discipline: Translated and Annotated with an Introduction*, STDJ 1 (Leiden: Brill, 1957), 155; followed by Gerhard Maier, *Mensch und freier Wille*, WUNT 12 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1971), 180–81. Cf. n. 56. Given the equation between the earth and the womb, between divine and human creation, it may be that sexual connotations are in fact present in the term. Additionally, Wernberg-Møller, *Manual*, 155, took מצירוק of 1QS XI 21 (/4Q264 1 9) (cf., too, 1QH^a XXIII 28, 36 [frg. 2 i 8, 16]; 4Q511 28+29 3) in the sense of “he is saliva which has been emitted,” dividing the characters in two and understanding מצִי as “something which has been squeezed out, emitted” (from the root מצֵה?); it would then, like מגבל מים in his interpretation, make figurative reference to male seed in conception. For alternative views and discussion, cf. DJD XL, 258.

- 103 Part of human distortion is due to the nature of “spirit” that influences the dust-man (רוח נעוה משלה בו; cf. too VIII 18). Moral impurity stems in part from this distorted spirit which corrupts the human condition. This seems to be the thought of the TST. 1QS IV: “Then God will refine (יברר), with his truth, all man’s deeds, and will purify for himself the structure of man (יקק לו מבני איש), ripping out all spirit of injustice from the innermost part 21 of his flesh (בשרו), and cleansing him (ולטהרו) with the spirit of holiness from every wicked deed. He will sprinkle over him the spirit of truth like lustral water (כמי נדה) (in order to cleanse him) from all the abhorrences of deceit (תועבות שקר) and (from) the defilement 22 of the unclean spirit (והתגולל ברוח נדה).” The text nicely illustrates how the sectarians avoided a Gnostic or Greek-type anthropological dualism, where flesh is irreparably evil. In fact, the problem with the flesh here is its spirit(!), a spirit which has been divinely given, but which will also be removed, giving the flesh a character it did not know even in creation. In the Hodayot, the *adam*-of-dust motif may encompass this anthropology through the negative construal of the pneumatic element in the story of the *adam*’s creation (Gen 2:7). This might be confirmed by the three-way relationship between the rabbinic doctrine of the two *yetzers*, the doctrine of the two-spirits, and its radicalization in the Hodayot. Cf. P. Wernberg-Møller, “Reconsideration of the Two Spirits in the Rule of the Community (IQSerek III,13–IV,26),” *RevQ* 3 (1961): 413–41; Collins, “Interpretations.” On the relationship between the Hodayot and the TST, cf. n. 35. It is worth noting that the TST, unlike the Hodayot, does not evidence any consternation over the innate sexual impurity of the human being, which would seem to be independent of this negative spiritual element and perhaps also require a more radical transformation than the TST describes.

The concentration on human impurity in the above texts is given more epigrammatic expression in the *Maskil's* Psalm: "in his justice he will cleanse me from the uncleanness of the human being (יִטְהַרְנִי מִנְדַּת אָנוּשׁ) and from the sin of the sons of man" (1QS XI 14–15). The parallelism in this text conforms to the close relationship the Sectarial Psalms draw between impurity and sin: The one is indicative of the other. Here, however, the sexual element of human congenital impurity does not appear to be pronounced. Klawans rightly cites the ritual terminology in this text, as well as that in 1QH^a IX 24, as evidence that the boundaries between moral and ritual purity have broken down at Qumran. He points to the use of terms for *ritual* impurity to describe *moral* sinfulness.¹⁰⁴ A stronger claim can be made, however, for the first three texts considered above (1QH^a V 31–33; IX 23–25; and XX 27–29), where the abhorrence which is typically (though not exclusively) associated with matters of moral impurity is transferred to the innate ritual-sexual impurity of the human condition.¹⁰⁵ Ezekiel 36:17 perhaps comes closest to this in the biblical tradition: "Mortal, when the house of Israel lived on their own soil, they defiled it (וַיִּטְמְאוּ אוֹתָהּ) with their ways and their deeds; their conduct in my sight was like the uncleanness of a woman in her menstrual period (בְּטִמְאַת הַנִּדָּה)." The Hodayot share with this text (cf., too, Ezek 18:5–9; Isa 64:5 [E: 6]; 2 Sam 3:29) an abhorrence for ritual-sexual defilement, but differ from it in elevating such defilement to a normative rather than occasional ontological category. In Ezekiel the people's conduct is as abhorrent as sexual impurity, but in the Hodayot people *per se*, as congenitally sexually impure creatures, can be considered abhorrent. The frayed remains of the last phrases of 1QH^a XXIII, in fact, appear to refer to the speaker twice as יִצֵּר נִתְעַב, an "abhorrent creature" (ll. 37–38).

A look at the scriptural antecedents of the above and related texts will highlight the intensified focus on the impurity of the human condition in the Hodayot.

The Hodayot's deconstruction of the *adam*-of-dust motif is most in debt to the book of Job.¹⁰⁶ One clear connector is the unique Joban phrase, in the HB,

104 Klawans, *Impurity and Sin*, 78.

105 Cf. Harrington, *The Purity Texts*, 56–57.

106 Carol Newsom has also pointed to Ps 14:1b, 3//53:2b, 4 (E: 3b, 5) as sharing the language of loathing, but she notes that "the language is not referred directly to the speaker." She has revised her original estimation of the influence of Joban traditions (esp. 4:17–21; 15:14–16; 25:4–6), now accepting and independently emphasizing their significance for the Hodayot; cf. Newsom, *Symbolic Space*, 220 n. 44; eadem, "Moral Self," 23–24.

“born of woman” (יְלֹד אִשָּׁה; cf. 14:1ff.; 15:14–16; 25:4–6).¹⁰⁷ It appears not only in v 31, above, but also in XXI 2 and 9 (both partially reconstructed), XXIII 13–14, and 1QS XI 21. While the term (or typically its plural) occurs in Sir 10:8 and the NT (Matt 11:11//Luke 7:28; Gal 4:4 [sing.]), only the Joban texts are linked in their contexts to the Hodayot by form-critical elements. In particular, 15:14 and 25:4 (but cf. 14:1+4) take the shape of the “anthropological interrogatives,” which in the biblical tradition seem to develop from Ps 8:5 (E: 4). Chapter 15 of Job, for instance, reads,

14 What are mortals (מְה־אָנוּשׁ), that they can be clean (כִּי־יִזְכֶּה)? Or those born of woman (יְלֹד אִשָּׁה), that they can be righteous? 15 God puts no trust even in his holy ones, and the heavens are not clean (לֹא־זָכוּ) in his sight; 16 how much less one who is abominable and corrupt (גִּתְעָב וְנֹאֲלָח), one who drinks iniquity like water!

And chapter 25,

4 How then can a mortal be righteous before God (וְמִה־יִצְדֵּק אָנוּשׁ עַם־אֵל)? How can one born of woman be pure (וְמִה־יִזְכֶּה יְלֹד אִשָּׁה)? 5 If even the moon is not bright and the stars are not pure (זָכוּ) in his sight, 6 how much less a mortal (אָנוּשׁ), who is a maggot (רֶמָּה), and a human being (וּבֶן־אָדָם), who is a worm (תּוֹלְעָה)!

Whereas there is little reason in the Joban texts to attribute any particular sexual significance to the term יְלֹד אִשָּׁה,¹⁰⁸ it may yet evoke such connotations for those who are inclined toward them. 1QHodayot^a v 31–33 is distinguished from the Joban texts by the appearance of terms which transfer a deep ambivalence about sexuality and ritual impurity to the human being in general. It is hard, therefore, to fail to see such a move as anticipated already in that text’s use of the phrase יְלֹד אִשָּׁה.¹⁰⁹ This appears to be a familiar sectarian reaccentuation of the language of the biblical tradition.¹¹⁰ The Joban texts establish

107 Cf. the section below, “A Mortal in the Presence of its Maker,” for more on the connection between the book of Job and the Hodayot.

108 The language of purity is both syntactically distanced from the phrase (in 15:14) and (mostly) non-cultic, but cf. Job 14:1+4.

109 Its other appearances in the Hodayot and 1QS continue to have a negative valence and associations with sin, but the sexual connotations are not as clearly to the fore: 1QH^a XXI 2, 9 (both partially reconstructed); XXIII 13–14; 1QS XI 20.

110 On this phenomenon, cf. Newsom, *Symbolic Space*, 267.

an ontological argument against the possibility of true human righteousness based on the logic of greater-to-lesser, “if not the heavenly, then certainly not the earthly,” while the Hodayot text needs no further proof than human creatureliness itself, which bears the signs of total sinfulness in its own innate impurity.

In addition to Joban traditions, the Sectarial Psalms’ deprecation of the human condition also reflects the influence of another scriptural text. Psalm 51:7 (E: 5) reads ambiguously, הִן־בְּעֹוֹן חוֹלְלֵתִי וּבְהֶטָא יַחְמִתֵּנִי אָמִי. Two texts appear to have been influenced by this statement:

[30] What being of flesh is like this (מִי בֶשֶׁר כִּזְאוֹת)? And what creature of clay (יֶצֶר חָמֶר) is able to do wondrous greet deeds? It (exists) in sin ³¹ from the womb (וְהוּא בְּעֹוֹן מֵרַחֵם), and until old age in faithless guilt. (1QH^a XI)

³⁹ [But I am] an unc[lean per]son (וְאֲנִי אִישׁ טָמֵא) [and from the womb of the one who conceived me (וּמֵרַחֵם הוֹרִיתִי) (I have lived) in faithless guilt, and from the breasts of my mother]in iniquity, and in the bosom ⁴⁰ [of my nurse (attached) to great impurity (לְרֹיב נֹדָה), and from my childhood in blood guilt (בְּדַמִּים),¹¹¹ and unto old age in the iniquity of flesh (בְּעֹוֹן בֶּשֶׁר)] (1QH^a XV)¹¹²

These are classic examples of the application of terminology of purity to moral concerns, a phenomenon known in the biblical tradition, and expressive of Klawans’ category of moral impurity. What distinguishes these texts from the biblical tradition is the insistence that this impurity attaches to the human being *in utero*, which is only one possible way to take Ps 51:7 (E: 5).¹¹³ If this sense is adopted of the psalm text, there is still reason to attribute it to poetic-hyperbole, whereas the same is not likely to apply to the Hodayot. The emphasis here on the human creature *per se* as morally impure (אִישׁ טָמֵא, יֶצֶר חָמֶר, בֶּשֶׁר) speaks against such an interpretation. Yet, these texts differ from the

111 The appearance of this term further confirms that Ps 51 (cf. v. 16 [E: 14]) is the literary precursor to this text.

112 The text is restored based on overlapping text in 4QH^b 10 1–6; the final phrase בְּעֹוֹן בֶּשֶׁר, which occurs in 1QS XI 13 (see below) is a conjecture, for which, cf. DJD XL, 212–13. Contrast these sentiments with Noah’s claims for himself in 1QapGen VI 1–2. (I thank Dan Machiela for the reference.)

113 Unlike the Psalm, the Hodayot texts leave no room to implicate the mother or the process of conception in sin. The preposition *mem* before “womb” is indicative of the thought of the text, which spans the furthest points of the *psalmist’s* life to describe the saturation of the human being in moral defilement.

preceding examples from the Hodayot in that moral defilement, or the defilement of sin, remains the primary locus of self-deprecation, while there is little hint that congenital sexual defilement is in view. Nevertheless, the insistence on the pervasiveness of sin and the foregrounding of human ontology and not merely the will as complicit in this condition take a step beyond the scriptural inheritance of the sectarians, at least in emphasis.¹¹⁴

The deep loathing of human ontology which is expressed partly in the identification of ritual and moral impurity and partly in the attribution of the pervasive presence of sin in the human creature does not exist in a vacuum in the Hodayot, nor is it primarily an outgrowth of excessive prudishness or despondency. Rather it is contextually determined by the experience of otherworldly communion. In particular, this ontology marks human beings as ill-suited for membership in an otherworldly priesthood. This logic begins to be expressed in the *Maskil's* Psalm, where moral defilement (rather than also the more radical innate sexual defilement) seems to be strictly in view:

[5] My eyes have observed what always is, ⁶ wisdom that has been hidden from mankind, knowledge and prudent understanding (hidden) from the sons of man, fount of justice and well of ⁷ strength and spring of glory (hidden) from the assembly of flesh. To those whom God has selected he has given them as everlasting possession; and he has given them an inheritance in the lot of ⁸ the holy ones (בגורל קדושים). He unites their assembly to the sons of the heavens (בני שמים) in order (to form) the council of the Community and a foundation of the building of holiness (וסוד מבנית קודש) to be an everlasting plantation (למטעת עולם) throughout all ⁹ future ages. However, I belong to evil humankind (לאדם רשעה), to the assembly of unfaithful flesh (ולסוד בשר עול); my failings, my iniquities, my sins, {...} with the depravities of my heart, ¹⁰ belong to the assembly of worms (ולסוד רמה) and of those who walk in darkness. ...^[12] if I fall in the sin of the flesh (ואם אכשול בעון בשר), in the justice of God, which endures eternally, shall my judgment be ...^[14] in his justice he will cleanse me from the uncleanness of ¹⁵ the human being (יטהרני מנדת אנוש) and from the sin of the sons of man. (1QS XI)

114 Hultgren suggests, against the view that they are additions, that these statements, particularly in col. XI, prepared for the more expansive and radical comments on human ontology found in the Community Psalms; *Covenant*, 415–16.

The text begins with motifs that will be correlated via 1QS III–IV and 1QH^a IV to the theme of *adam's* glory (ll. 5–7) and culminates in the elects' participation in the life and worship of the angels (ll. 7–9). The elect community is described as a foundation of the building of *holiness* and an *everlasting* plantation. These extraordinary conditions are strained by the psalmist's creatureliness: he speaks of “evil humankind” (l. 9), “unfaithful flesh” (l. 9), “sin of the flesh” (l. 12), and “the uncleanness of the human being” (ll. 14–15). A real problem is posed: How can a human being—whose creatureliness is corrupt—possibly participate in the eternal and heavenly worship of a righteous God? The same tension between ontology and destiny is observed in 1QH^a XI:

20 I thank you, Lord, that you have redeemed my life from the pit, and that from Sheol-Abaddon 21 you have lifted me up to an eternal height (העליתני ואתהלכה במישור לאין), so that I walk about on a limitless plain (לרום עולם), I know that there is hope (מקוה) for one whom 22 you have formed from the dust for an eternal council (לאשר יצרתה מעפר לסוד עולם). And a perverted spirit (רוח נעוה) you have purified (טהרתה) from great sin that it might take its place with 23 the host of the holy ones (להתיצב מבעמד עם) and enter into community with the congregation of the children of heaven (ולבוא ביחד עם עדת בני שמים). And you cast for the man an eternal lot with the spirits 24 of knowledge (ותפל לאיש גורל עולם עולם רוחות) (דעת), that he might praise your name in a common rejoicing (ביחד רנה) and recount your wonderful acts before all your works.

Here the divine plan for humanity (seen in its גורל) both creates and bridges the chasm between human ontology (רוח נעוה and עפר)¹¹⁵ and human teleology (לסוד עולם, etc.). Lichtenberger argues that while the worshiper remains flesh, a transformation has taken place qualitatively (purification, angelic life) and functionally (angelic activities associated with knowledge, service and praise).¹¹⁶ It is possible that the text also anticipates a more radical transformation or recreation (cf. XIX 13–17, esp. 16, חדש) of the human condition in order to make it finally suitable for the heavenly communion. Likewise, col. VII 28–30 describes the destiny of the righteous as “eternal salvation and everlasting peace, without lack” (l. 29) and interprets this anthropologically in the following way: “And so you raise his glory higher than flesh” (ותרם מבשר כבודו),

115 The second term is related to the created human condition in 1QH^a v 30–33; cf., too, 1QS IV 20–22.

116 Lichtenberger, *Menschenbild*, 225–26.

ll. 29–30).¹¹⁷ Sjöberg stressed that a necessity for transformation within the Hodayot confirms its “sehr pessimistische Auffassung vom Menschen.”¹¹⁸ At the very least a “purification” (טהרה) of the nature of the human-being is required in order for humankind to fulfill its destiny, so human nature is viewed as an obstacle and becomes an object of self-abasement. This is so even in such texts as immediately above where the less radical moral defilement of the human creature is in view, where the distaste of the psalmist for human creatureliness is expressed without evoking congenital sexual impurity as in 1QH^a v 31–33; IX 23–25; and XX 27–29 which employ terms for humanity such as “spring of impurity,” “obscene shame,” and “foundation of shame/nakedness”.

How completely is purification effected in the sectarian’s liturgical life? Opting for the overwhelming efficacy of their institutions, Fletcher-Louis points to cultic terminology and associations in the above text from 1QH^a XI as evidence of the movement into paradise that occurs within the liturgical life of the community.¹¹⁹ Contrariwise, Klawans advocates for a model of “quasi-purity at Qumran” and suggests that the sectarians sustained a “culture of inadequacy” toward their own limited institutions of ritual cleansing and atonement.¹²⁰ For Klawans the Thanksgiving Psalms’ “pessimistic views concerning the pervasiveness of defilement and the limited human capacity to overcome it” should temper too strong an emphasis on the sectarians as a “purity-community” who view themselves as a substitute for the corrupt cult of the Jerusalem temple—or who enter into paradise, for that matter.¹²¹

117 כבוד and בשר admit of at least two interpretations here. “Flesh” may be understood as “humanity” and “glory” as status, together in this sentence signifying the speaker’s superior honour compared to his fellow human beings. Alternatively, “flesh” may be taken corporeally rather than corporately and “glory” ontologically rather than (merely) honorifically, together signifying a transformation in the speaker’s creaturely nature. The second interpretation suits the predestinarian context better (cf. ll. 27ff.), as well as the confluence of these terms or their synonyms in related texts, such as XI 21–24, but also XIX 13–17 and XXVI 27–30.

118 Erik Sjöberg, “Neuschöpfung in den Toten-Meer-Rollen,” *ST* 9 (1955): 133.

119 Thematically, the text is self-evidently concerned with participation in the heavenly liturgy (עדות בני שמים, סוד עולם) and the purification (טהרה) required for it (cf. 1QM VII 4–7; 1QSa II 3–9); additionally, Fletcher-Louis hears cultic associations in the phrase ואתה לכה במישור (cf. Mal 2:6) and מקוה (“miqveh,” referring to the numerous physical remains of such institutions at the site of Qumran); cf. *All the Glory*, 108–12.

120 Klawans, “Purity in the Dead Sea Scrolls,” 395–96.

121 Ibid. For critique of the “purity-community model” and its stress on the extraordinary concern for purity at Qumran, cf. *ibid.*, 388–95. For critique of the community as temple hypothesis, cf. Jonathan Klawans, *Purity, Sacrifice, and the Temple: Symbolism and Supersessionism in the Study of Ancient Judaism* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005),

Perhaps, a middle-way between these views best represents the evidence: Fletcher-Louis' tendency to deny the eschatological element in the Hodayot¹²² bespeaks his over-emphasis on the present-time fulfillment of human destiny in the liturgy of the sectarians and his undermining of the psalmists' persistent dissatisfaction with human ontology; Klawans' privileging of the pessimism of the Hodayot strains to account for the sense one has that the psalmists have indeed already experienced something of the transcendent heavenly life.¹²³ Nevertheless, the pervasiveness of the *Niedrigkeitsdoxologien* clearly signals some level of anticipation and dissatisfaction with the present situation of the sectarians. Ritual purifications and the present state of the body can only grant temporary access to an eternal communion.

In conclusion, then, the Hodayot bring sin and impurity into a mutual relationship, and in the most extreme cases the ritual-sexual impurity that inheres in the human condition becomes indicative of the depravity of humanity. Thus William Loader is incorrect to write of the Hodayot that "human sexuality . . . never appears as in itself a source of evil or as something to be despised."¹²⁴ This statement does not sufficiently account for the Hodayot's penchant for choosing words evocative of sexual impurity or sexuality in order to characterize the human condition as morally repugnant. Loader refrains from attributing any ontological significance to such statements, despite the fact that they often answer the question "what is a human being?" Whereas Loader writes helpfully that the Hodayot pose the paradox of "reconciling self-deprecation and belief in divine creation" and rightly suggests that "theistic predestination" makes such a paradox possible,¹²⁵ he steps back from the implications of this when he echoes J. Becker's view that human sin is simply confessed without any reflection on its origin.¹²⁶ Conversely, I have pointed

162–68; Susan Haber, *"They Shall Purify Themselves": Essays on Purity in Early Judaism*, ed. Adele Reinhartz (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2008), 106–24.

122 For instance, with reference to 4Q427 7 ii 2–7; cf. Fletcher-Louis, *All the Glory*, 210.

123 Fletcher-Louis suggests that rather than attribute the tension in the Hodayot's anthropology to the eschatological now and the not yet one might better speak of a tension "between different modes, times and places within the liturgical and cultic world." *Ibid.*, 112. Yet, surely, *both* realities (tensions) must be maintained: there is an eschatological "now" and a "not yet," and the "now" is manifest (in part) in the disruption of ordinary time in the liturgy of the community. For a consideration of the "now" and "not yet" tension from a perspective of the poetic genre of the Hodayot, cf. Ken Penner, "Realized or Future Salvation in the Hodayot," *Journal of Biblical Studies* 2 (2002): 1–49.

124 Loader, *Dead Sea Scrolls*, 254 (cf. 250–54; 348–51).

125 *Ibid.*, 250–51.

126 *Ibid.*, 251 n. 63; cf. Becker, *Das Heil Gottes*, 138.

to indications that human sin and impurity are grounded in creation. Human sexuality—linked to creation through the earth/womb—becomes deeply problematic for at least certain of these psalmists and emblematic of a human creature whose proper destiny is intrinsically out-of-reach.¹²⁷ At times and in places earth and heaven may touch, but the psalmists' find themselves continually dragged down by the earthly body and its defilements. Like death and decay, even the occasional taint of ritual defilement is ultimately irreconcilable with eternal life in a heavenly liturgy. From such an otherworldly perspective, if once ritually defiled, then always ritually defiled.¹²⁸

A Mortal in the Presence of its Maker: On a Theme from Job

As is now clear, the Hodayot wrestle profoundly with the problem of how a human being can stand in the presence of God. A common motif of religious thought concerns the strain which is put on the humanity of one who comes

127 Similarly, cf. Schiffman, *Reclaiming*, 151.

128 John Collins regards the company of angels as undergirding the "logic of celibacy," pointing to 1 En. 15; cf. Collins, "The Angelic Life," in *Metamorphoses: Resurrection, Body and Transformative Practices in Early Christianity*, ed. Turid Karlsen Seim and Jorunn Økland, Ekstasis 1 (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2009), 301. Whether there was such a practice of celibacy among those who wrote these psalms cannot be considered here. However, participation in the otherworldly communion provides an important context for grasping the implicit denigration of human sexuality therein. This is indeed confirmed by 1 En. 15, wherein the watchers are condemned for defiling themselves with women, who are said to be created strictly for purposes of procreation among mortals whereas they, angelic beings, "originally existed as spirits, living forever . . . therefore I did not make women among you" (6–7); cf. the translation of George W. E. Nickelsburg in *1 Enoch: The Hermeneia Translation* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2012). Much later texts, in 3 Enoch, externalize the perception that the sexuality of humanity is out-of-place in the heavenly world by putting it into the mouths of angels. When Rabbi Ishmael ascends to heaven, he reports that the angels caught his scent and asked, "What is this smell of the one born of woman? Why does a white drop ascend on high and serve among those who cleave the flames?" (6:2–3). Later when the angel Metatron reveals to Moses the secret by which heaven and earth were made, the angels are said by him to have objected, asking, "Why are you revealing this secret to mankind, born of woman, blemished, unclean, defiled by blood and impure flux, men who excrete putrid drops?" (48D:8). In the Hodayot we find these perceptions of incongruity on the lips of the human being, who feels in some sense radically out-of-place as a sexual being among the heavenly hosts. The contexts and issues are not identical, but the prominence of accusations of sexual misconduct against the attendants at the earthly temple also speaks to heightened awareness of the problematics of sexuality for the community behind these scrolls; cf. Joseph L. Angel, *Otherworldly and Eschatological Priesthood in the Dead Sea Scrolls*, STDJ 86 (Leiden: Brill, 2010), 214–20.

before the divine, and the biblical tradition furnishes numerous examples. With a few others who have early and of late emphasized the importance of the book of Job for the Hodayot,¹²⁹ I want to suggest that the author(s) of these psalms were deeply affected by its probing of this theme.

The topic of “standing before God” is a significant feature of each section of the book of Job. One may begin with the implicit contrast between human and divine beings (בְּנֵי הָאֱלֹהִים) in the prologue; whereas the latter routinely present themselves before the LORD (לְהִתְיַצֵּב עַל־יְהוָה, 1:6; 2:1), in direct open communication, Job has not the benefit of direct access, though he does appear as God’s “servant” (עֶבֶד) and performs the functions of a priest, mediating between his family and God (1:5). The same divine figures appear as a chorus of worshipers privy to the secrets of the universe in the Whirlwind Speeches in order to remind Job of his own *lack* of knowledge (38:4–7). In the dialogues, Job’s harmonious relationship with God famously breaks down: while his friends insist that he cannot be pure or righteous before God (4:17, 15:14; 25:4), Job protests that he is, but that as a mere hireling or slave labourer (7:1–2), he lacks an effective setting or mediator by which to establish his case before an almighty God (chs. 9–10). If God would withdraw his hand a bit, then maybe Job could answer and challenge him (9:34; 13:22); instead, God remains

129 Berg, “Religious Epistemologies.” William Tooman points to two instances of uniquely Joban expressions reflected in the Hodayot: “Between Imitation and Interpretation: Reuse of Scripture and Composition in Hodayot (1QH^a) 11:6–19,” *DSD* 18 (2011): 69–70. More expansively, Dwight Swanson points to evidence that the Elihu speeches shaped the Maskil’s instruction in 4QCryp^a, culminating in the suggestion that “the editor who placed the Elihu speech in the book of Job is presenting a viewpoint which uses catchwords of a group which later is represented at Qumran—for the purpose of showing the inadequacy of its arguments. In Job, then, we may be witness to one of the early arguments involving the precursors of the Qumran community”; cf. Dwight D. Swanson, “4QCrypa Words of the Maskil to All Sons of Dawn: The Path of the Virtuous Life,” in *Sapiential, Liturgical and Poetical Texts from Qumran: Proceedings of the Third Meeting of the International Organization for Qumran Studies, Oslo, 1998: Published in Memory of Maurice Baillet*, ed. Maurice Baillet et al., STDJ 35 (Leiden: Brill, 2000), 53–56, here 56. In early scholarship, Hans Kosmala, *Hebräer, Essener, Christen: Studien zur Vorgeschichte der frühchristlichen Verkündigung*, StPB 1 (Leiden: Brill, 1959), 292, spoke of Job as an Essene “Vorbild.” E. W. Tuinstra argued that the Aramaic translation of Job (11Q10) made the figure of Job typological of the Teacher of Righteousness; *Hermeneutische aspecten van de Targum van Job uit grot XI van Qumran* (Groningen: Dissertation, Rijksuniversiteit te Groningen, 1970), 66–69. Others have highlighted a similar theology of suffering; cf. Jean Carmignac, “La théologie de la souffrance dans les hymnes de Qumrân,” *RevQ* 3 (1961): 386. In light of evidence to be discussed below, it does not seem unlikely that the Hodayot are indebted to 11Q10.

a hidden adversary (13:24). As the dialogues unfold, Job becomes more hopeful of finding a mediator and seeing God in his flesh (cp. 9:33, מוֹכִיחַ; 16:18–22, עַד, שָׁחַד, and מְלִיץ;¹³⁰ 19:23–27, גֹּאֵל), and thus he grows bolder about the prospect of facing God in a lawsuit. He ends his personal defence with the confidence to assert that he would “approach” (קָרַב) God “as a prince” (31:37, נָגִיד). When, at last, Job’s eye sees God (cf. 42:5) in a tempest (סְעָרָה, 38:1; 40:6), with no mediator between them, Job’s initial fears of divine power appear to come to fruition: Can Job gird his loins and stand to answer the Creator of the universe (38:3; 40:7)? Does he have knowledge of (divine) counsel (עֲצָה, 12:13; 38:2; 40:3; סוֹד, 15:8), the wonders of God (נִפְלְאוֹת, 5:9; 9:10; 37:14; 42:3)? Despite his stuttering, deferential offerings (40:4–5; 42:2–6), which suggest that things might turn badly for him, Job appears finally to be vindicated and restored as priest and servant of God (42:7–8).

The focus will be primarily on two passages from 1QH^a XX–XXII. They are, alas, very fragmentary but anthropologically rich. Two initial sections demonstrate the *Maskil*’s possession of “wondrous secret counsel” (xx 15): his worship is properly synchronized to the variations in the cosmos (ll. 7–15) and his community is synchronized to the divine will (ll. 15–27). But he is painfully aware that none of this can be attributed to his own merit nor is it even compatible with what he knows of his humanity as such. In order to express this, the psalmist launches into a familiar *Niedrigkeitsdoxologie*, the individual motifs of which appear, uniquely, again and again throughout these columns.¹³¹

As the initial doxology demonstrates (i.e., 1QH^a XX 27–31), these statements are heavily indebted to Joban anthropological terminology and attitudes. The *Maskil* describes himself as “nipped from clay” (ומחמר ק[ורצתי], XX 27),¹³² using an exact phrase from Job involving an uncommon word (33:6: מִחֶמֶר קֶרֶץ־תִּי).¹³³ He asks, “what can dust and ashes (עפר ואפר) reply” to God’s judgment or “how can it stand before (יחיצב לפני) the one who reproves (מוכיח) it?” (ll. 30–31). Such queries recall the exact situation (theophany) in which Job too used the rare phrase “dust and ashes” (42:6)¹³⁴ and also confessed his loss for

130 On the textual problems here and for the extension of the plea for the mediator into v. 20ff, cf. Marvin H. Pope, *Job*, 3rd ed., AB (Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1973), 122, 125–26; David J. A. Clines, *Job 1–20*, WBC (Nashville: Word Books, 1989), 368, 371.

131 Cf. n. 50.

132 The reconstruction of the verb and the restoration of the noun are supported by 1QH^a XVIII 5–6; 1QS XI 22; 4Q511 28+29 4.

133 For קֶרֶץ, cf. also Ps 35:19; Prov 6:13; 10:10; 16:30.

134 In HB appearing only also in Gen 18:27; Job 30:19; cf., too, Sir 10:9; 17:32; 40:3; 1QH^a XVIII 7; XXIII 27; XXVI 35 (=4QH^a 7 ii 16); 4Q267 1 5; 4Q511 126 2; cf. 1QH^a XXI 25–26.

words (42:3), when God called upon him to elucidate the divine plan (38:2–3) and answer for his charges against divine justice (40:7–8). In another statement, where the author concedes, “As for me, *I remain silent. What could I say concerning this? According to my knowledge I have spoken*, a creature mixed from clay” (xx 35), one might again hear echoes of Job’s deferential response to the divine epiphany: “See, I am of small account; *what shall I answer you? I lay my hand on my mouth*. I have spoken once, and I will not answer; twice, but will proceed no further . . . Therefore *I have uttered what I did not understand*, things too wonderful for me, which I did not know” (40:4–5; 42:3). These statements agree not only in the general disposition of the speaker but *in resolving upon silence after having spoken out of creaturely ignorance*. Later the psalmist will use the Joban phrase “born of a woman” in a self-effacing manner (xxi 2, 9–10). The *Maskil* has absorbed the critique levelled by Job’s friends against the possibility of taking confidence in human righteousness, and he has made Job’s self-effacing response before the Divine interlocutor his own.

The next column of the same psalm contains an even more striking resemblance to Job’s (final) response to the theophany (עֲלֵכֶן אֶמְאָס וְנַחֲמָתִי עַל-עַפְּרָר, וְאֶפְרָר, 42:6), especially according to the understanding of that response that is found in the Qumran Aramaic translation of Job (11Q10).¹³⁵ 1QHodayot^a xxi is fragmentary but rich in evocations of the psalmist’s election before God: he has insight into wonders (l. 7), likely some kind of association with the heavenly host (l. 9), is brought into covenant (l. 10), and has some experience of

135 Although the possibility of a sectarian provenance of the work was early suggested (by Tuinstra) and then roundly abandoned (by nearly all others), the date of this copy (late Herodian) indicates, at the very least, an abiding interest in the text in circles associated with the finds at Qumran. For a study of hermeneutical aspects in the translation, and an argument for the sectarian origin of the work, highlighting affinities with the Hodayot, cf. Tuinstra, *Hermeneutische aspecten*. For an early and brief appraisal of the figure of Job in the Qumran community, and a rejection of Tuinstra’s hypothesis, cf. Joseph A. Fitzmyer, “Some Observations on the Targum of Job from Qumran Cave 11,” *CBQ* 36 (1974): 504–8, 508–13. Concerning the nature of the work as an Aramaic translation, cf. David Shepherd, *Targum and Translation: A Reconsideration of the Qumran Aramaic Version of Job* (Assen: Uitgeverij Van Gorcum, 2004). Finally, for the text itself, cf. Florentino García Martínez, E. J. C. Tigchelaar, and A. S. van der Woude, eds., *Qumran Cave 11.11: (11Q2–18, 11Q20–31)*, DJD xxiii (Oxford: Clarendon, 1998); Michael Sokoloff, *The Targum to Job from Qumran Cave XI* (Ramat-Gan: Bar-Ilan University, 1974); J. P. M. van der Ploeg and A. S. van der Woude, eds., *Le Targum de Job de La Grotte XI de Qumrân* (Leiden: Brill, 1971). The discovery of a second Aramaic translation, dating to roughly the same period, and preserving portions of chs. 3–5, 4Q157, should be noted, as well as the existence of four Hebrew texts of Job (2Q15; 4Q99; 4Q100; 4Q101). One of these (4Q101) is written in Paleo-Hebrew script, usually reserved for Torah scrolls.

“the eternal dwelling for the light of dawn forever” and “times of peace without li[mit]” (ll. 15–16; cf. “paths of peace,” l. 26). Evidently, despite confidence in his own election, the psalmist remains in an ambiguous position; from a phenomenological point of view, he is threatened by demonic traps and nets (ll. 20–21; 35–36), and appears to understand them as indicative of divine testing. The *Maskil* ponders how he might fare before God’s tribunal:

[24] איכה ²⁵ אשמר ביצר עפר מהתפרד ומת{ו} דונג בהמס לפני אש [] ²⁶ ומקוי אפר איכה אעמוד לפני רוח סוער]ה

[24] How ²⁵ can I, as a creature of dust, be preserved from being divided and from dissolving (like) wax when it melts before the fire[] ²⁶ and a heap of ashes. How can I stand before the stormy win[d]? (1QH^a XXI + 4QH^b 13 1–2; 4QH^a 11 1–5)¹³⁶

The Qumran Aramaic Job’s translation of the notoriously difficult Hebrew of Job’s second reply to the theophanic “storm” (MT 38:1, 40:6; סַעָרָה; 11Q10 XXXIV 2: ועננא [ר]וא) furnishes some noteworthy comparisons.

[7] למשמע אדן שמעתך וכען עיני ⁸ חזתך על כן אתנסך ואתמ״א {א} ואהוא לעפר ⁹ וקטם

[7] I have heard of you only by hearsay, and now my eye ⁸ has seen you; for this I will be poured out and dissolved, and I will turn into dust ⁹ and ashes. (11Q10 XXXVII)

This translation suggests that the ambiguous אמאס of Job 42:6 was understood not as מאס, “to refuse,” or “reject,” but rather מסס, “to melt”; hence, “I am poured out and dissolved” to which can be compared the *Maskil*’s expression,

136 This is the text as Stegemann read it (cf. DJD XL, 266 for notes on readings). Qimron, *Hebrew Writings*, 1:92–93, differs on two points: מהתפרד is transcribed with a final *resh* and בהמס with an initial *mem* rather than *beth*. Concerning the latter, Stegemann admitted that *mem* is the easier reading paleographically, but allowed the likely overlap with 4QH^a 11 3 to push him to the more difficult but not impossible reading of the *beth*; the difference does not affect the present matter. On the other hand, Stegemann was certain of the verb פרד, citing the overlap with 4QH^b 13 8, which Schuller (DJD XIX, 118, 148) also read as פרתפרד (in the transcription of the overlapping segment of 4QH^a 11 3 the verb is mistakenly restored with a second *resh*). There is little at stake in the choice of verb here for the present discussion. Contextually, פרד would be slightly favoured (cf. 1QH^a xv 7; Ps 22:15 [E: 14]). Finally, it should be noted that ד{ו}מת is the verb נתך (cf. Ezek 22:22; so DJD XL, 266 and XIX, 119) rather than the prepositional phrase “in the midst.”

“divided and dissolved like wax when it melts (=מסס).”¹³⁷ The most distinct link between these texts, however, is found in the references to “ashes” (אפר/קטם).¹³⁸ The *Maskil*’s appended expression “and a heap of ashes” somehow describes the outcome of the dividing and dissolving, much in the way that the Aramaic translator understood the sense of Job’s last words invoking “dust and ashes” (42:6): “I will be poured out and dissolved, and *I will turn into dust and ashes*” (cf., too, the initial, יצר עפר of the *Maskil*’s description, xxI 25). Finally, the reference to taking a “stand before the stormy win[d]” (רוח סוער[ה]) can now also be seen as evoking the Joban sub-text. It would appear, then, that the confrontation between God and Job, and particularly, “Aramaic Job’s” acquiescence in his own inadequate humanity, became emblematic for the psalmist of his own standing before God; his humanity leaves him confounded and speechless before a righteous and all-powerful judge.

And yet the psalmist’s own confidence in God’s electing mercy may have been strengthened by the turn of events in Job. Here is a lead into the other half of the story of anthropogony in the Hodayot, the *adam* of glory tradition. Without a mediator to intervene (cf. Job 33:23), Job was vindicated and restored all the same. He was established again as servant of God and priest to his associates (42:7–10). Likewise, the psalmist also knows God’s righteousness as mercy, enjoys a priestly status, and celebrates immediate access to God ([בנים] מליץ, ולוא לאיש בינים/ואין מליץ [בנים], 4QH^a 7 ii 18–21; 1QH^a xxvi 36–40; cf., too, 1QH^a xiv 16).¹³⁹ If Job, both pre- and post-theophany, remains on the plane of “earthly” realities, and the divine beings remain for Job throughout a model of contrasting epistemology and ontology (cf. Job 38:4–7), the fairytale conclusion to Job’s story, with its many excessive blessings, including wealth, family, inheritance, and long-life—“the LORD blessed the latter days of Job more than his beginning” (Job 42:12)—might have inspired the psalmist’s rather more direct translation from an earthly to an immortal life. It has even been suggested that the depiction of the angels’ fellowship when they witnessed the wonders of creation (בְּרִן־יַחַד בּוֹכְבֵי בֶקֶר וַיִּרְעוּ כָּל־בְּנֵי אֱלֹהִים, 38:7) inspired the sectarians’ adoption of the term *yahad* to characterize their own epistemic insight and

137 “Melting,” “trembling,” “dissolving,” “withering” are common descriptions of the disintegration of one’s constitution when confronted by theophany (cf. 1QH^a xii 34–35; xviii 34–35); the other elements of the *Maskil*’s description are much more unique.

138 אפר also appears as the complement to עפר (“dust”) in 11Q10 xxxiv 8–9.

139 מליץ (cf. Job 33:23; 16:20) in the non-biblical corpus is rare; a search using M. Abegg’s *Qumran Sectarian Manuscripts* returns only one clear case outside the Hodayot with the sense of “mediator”: 4Q374 7 2 (and 4Q368 3 7?).

privileged participation in an angelic communion (cf., esp., Job 38:7a: בְּרִיַּיִחַד with 1QH^a XIX 17: בִּיחַד רְנָה).¹⁴⁰ This brings us from *adam*'s dust to *adam*'s glory.

Anthropogony: *Adam*'s Glory

The negative emphasis on *adam* as *adamah* does not prepare one for the Hodayot's more positive use of anthropogonic traditions to express an ideal humanity. Indeed, if scholarship on the Hodayot may be taken as the standard, the dominance of the *adam*-of-dust tradition has clouded the Hodayot's adoption of the *adam*-of-glory trope to express the exaltation of the speaker and his communion with the heavenly beings.¹⁴¹ But, as was said of Job, the latter days of *adam* will be greater than the beginning. Whereas Holm-Nielsen found that outside of the Psalms and the prophets, particularly Isaiah, the use of scripture in the Hodayot "bears the mark of being haphazard,"¹⁴² we in fact find a pattern. The lowliness passages contract the whole scope of human sinfulness into the creation from dust in Gen 2:6–7, while the exaltation passages seem to be grounded in the depiction of the creation of humanity in Gen 1:26–27 and Ps 8 and tend to depict the elect enjoying the pleasures of Eden or even being identified directly with the Garden.¹⁴³ Three texts or text-groups are particularly clear in their dependence on such traditions.

140 Cf. Peter Schäfer, *The Origins of Jewish Mysticism* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2011), 124–25.

141 Of course, there are exceptions, most prominent among them: Fletcher-Louis, *All the Glory*.

142 Holm-Nielsen, *Hodayot*, 312. Seemingly with the caveat of one undeveloped and not completely adequate observation: "Gen 1–3 is so used that one would understand the community to have considered its existence under eschatological circumstances as a reincarnation of the paradise of old, but at the same time the curse of man at the end of Gen 3 forms the assumed basis for the portrayal of man in his earthly corruptibility in the existing world" (ibid.).

143 Notably, Eden is enjoyed without any hint of the prohibitions on knowledge enjoined in Gen 2–3; rather, access to divine knowledge is celebrated in these texts. It is possible that this finds justification exegetically in Gen 1:29: "God said, 'See, I have given you *every* plant yielding seed that is upon the face of all the earth, and *every* tree with seed in its fruit; you shall have them for food.'"

Adam's Glory and Eden's Pleasures

In the first couple of texts, the psalmist appears twice to allude to traditions concerning primal or archetypal *adam* in contexts that have a positive bearing upon the relationship between God and humanity.¹⁴⁴

²⁶ []*th* for those who serve you loyally [so that] their posterity (זרעם) [may] be before you for all time. And [their] na[mes] you have raised up ²⁷ []transgression and casting out all their iniquities and giving them an inheritance in all the glory of *adam* for long life (ולהנחילם בכול כבוד) (אדם לרוב ימים) (1QH^a IV)

³⁸ [Blessed are you, God Most High, that] you have spread your holy spirit upon your servant[and you] have purified *m* []*t* his heart ³⁹ [hu] mankind (אנש), and to the whole covenant of *adam* (כול ברית אדם) I will look [] []*h* they will find it ⁴⁰ [w]*b* those who attain it and those who love it []*gk* for everlasting ages (לעולמי עד) (1QH^a IV)

In the first selection, an inheritance in “all the glory of *adam*” is preceded by forgiveness or purification from sins and explained as the bestowal of “long life.” In the second, the purification of the psalmist’s heart by God’s spirit is followed by the resolution to focus on the “whole covenant of *adam*.” The phrase the “glory of *adam*” is found only here in the Hodayot and in a few other texts closely associated with the sectarian movement behind the scrolls (cf. 1QS IV 23; CD III 18–IV 4; 4QPpS^a II 27–III 2, נחלת אדם; cf. also 4Q504 8 *recto* 4; Sir 49:16); the “covenant of *adam*” is not found elsewhere in the scrolls, and is textually uncertain.¹⁴⁵

¹⁴⁴ I treat the following selections from col. IV as coming from the same psalm; cf. Hartmut Stegemann, “The Number of Psalms in 1QHodayota and Some of Their Sections,” in *Liturgical Perspectives: Prayer and Poetry in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls, Proceedings of the Fifth International Symposium of the Orion Center for the Study of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Associated Literature, 19–23 January, 2000*, ed. E. Chazon, STDJ 48 (Leiden: Brill, 2003), 210–13. If this is not the case, the texts share some linguistic and contextual features that make it amenable to treat them together.

¹⁴⁵ The matter concerns the word “covenant” and the resulting phrase “covenant of *adam*,” whose meaning is regarded as unclear. The first and last letters of “covenant” are unproblematic, a *beth* and a *taw*. Sukenik read ברית, and Stegemann followed, although he considered adopting בינית; the latter is the reading of Puech and Qimron: Sukenik, *Scrolls*, 51; Puech, *La croyance*, 2:394 n. 286; Qimron, *Hebrew Writings*, 1:63. In DJD XL the problems with Sukenik’s reading are said to be that “the upper part of the second letter is unusually narrow for a *reš* (and no shrinkage of the leather can be observed at this point) and there

However, the TST presents a remarkably similar collocation of themes and a close juxtaposition of “covenant” with “glory of *adam*.” The text describes the time appointed for “visitation” (פקודה, l. 19; cf. ll. 18–20; 25–27), when God does away with the dominion of darkness:

[20] Then God will refine, with his truth, all man's deeds, and will purify for himself the structure of man (מבני איש),¹⁴⁶ ripping out all spirit of injustice from the innermost part²¹ of his flesh . . . he will sprinkle over him the spirit of truth like lustral water (in order to cleanse him) from all the abhorrences of deceit and (from) the defilement²² of the unclean spirit (ברוח נדה), in order to instruct the upright ones with knowledge of the Most High, and to make understand the wisdom of the sons of heaven to those of perfect behaviour. For those God has chosen for an everlasting covenant (לברית עולמים)²³ and to them shall belong all the glory of *adam* (כול כבוד אדם). (1QS IV)

Here a cleansing and transformation of the human condition, the “structure” and “flesh” (cf. “heart,” 1QH^a IV 38), by “spirit” precedes the fulfillment of the “everlasting covenant,” which entails the enjoyment of “all the glory of *adam*.” Earlier in the TST, the “reward” (פקודה) of those who walk “in the spirit of the sons of truth” (IV 6) is described as “healing, 7 plentiful peace in a long life (באורך ימים), fruitful offspring (פרות זרע) with all everlasting blessings (עם כול), eternal enjoyment with endless life (ושמחת עולמים בחיי נצח), and a crown of glory (וכליל כבוד) 8 with majestic raiment in eternal light (עם מדת הדר).” This reward, which mixes metaphors relating both to abundant mortal and *immortal* life and recalls traditions of royal man reflected in Pss 8:6

seems to be a bottom stroke at right angles that suggests a *bet*, less likely a *nun* or *kap*” (p. 72). I cannot detect this bottom stroke. The alternative **בִּינָת** is problematic concerning the third letter, since only a short, thin downstroke is visible on the faded leather. Contextually, one expects the object of **נִבְטָ** to be understood positively since it appears to be the antecedent of the suffixes on the following preserved verbs (**מִצָּא, נִשָּׂא, אָהַב**); this complicates Wise, Abegg’s and Cook’s translation, “I examine every human covenant,” and it fits poorly with the alternative reconstruction, which would necessitate something like “I examine all human understanding”; Michael O. Wise, Martin G. Abegg, and Edward M. Cook, *The Dead Sea Scrolls: A New Translation*, 2nd ed. (San Francisco: Harper, 2005), 173. I will try to show that **בְּרִית אָדָם**, which may yet be the best reading paleographically, is not so problematic semantically. For related uses of “covenant” in connection with Adam, cf. 4QpHos^b 7–8; Sir 17:11–12, 14; Apoc. Mos. 8:2; also important are 4Q504 8 *recto* 4–9 and LAB 13:8–9.

146 On this phrase, cf. Yigael Yadin, “A Note on DSD IV:20,” *JBL* 74 (1955): 40–43.

(E: 5) and 21:4–7 (E: 3–6), is surely expressive of the glory of *adam* that is promised to members of the eternal covenant in IV 22–23.¹⁴⁷

This requirement of anthropological transformation prior to the attainment of *adamic* glory is prepared for in the opening statement of the TST, which relates the divine intention for, and creation of, humanity: “[God] created man (אָנוּשׁ) to rule the world and placed within him two spirits so that he would walk with them until the moment of his visitation (פְּקוּדָתוֹ); they are the spirits of truth and of deceit” (1QS III 17–19). Here, remarkably, God’s creative intention for humankind—“to rule the world”, recalling Gen 1:26–28 and Ps 8—is mismatched or *strained* by God’s actual creation of humankind—“placed within him two spirits”, recalling Gen 2:7.¹⁴⁸ The fulfillment of God’s creative intention, therefore, requires a “new creation” (עֲשׂוֹת חֲדָשָׁה, IV 25), at the time of “visitation” (פְּקוּדָה, III 18; IV 19; cf. ll. 18–20, 25–27), which involves the restructuring of the human frame, the “ripping out the spirit of injustice” (IV 20). Thus the “glory of *adam*” does not involve a straightforward return to “pre-lapsarian” humanity, for created human ontology is part of the problem to be resolved. The “glory of *adam*,” therefore, is more a hope than it is an ontological model of humanity, a promissory feature of divine intentionality for humankind that awaits the proper anthropological conditions for fulfillment. Insofar as the phrase looks back to Adam, it looks back to the conditions Adam enjoyed (for a time) in Eden, but for which Adam’s creaturely nature proved him to be unsuitable. Adam himself is less an object of idealization than that which Adam necessarily forfeited.¹⁴⁹ The phrase “glory of *adam*,” then, refers to the glory which is intended for or proper to humanity but for which humanity, as Adam proved, has not yet been properly constituted. In this sense, the

147 Similar also is 1QH^a XVII 24–28.

148 Though noted by Wernberg-Møller, “Two Spirits,” the tension is not often remarked upon; but cf. Lichtenberger, *Menschenbild*, 124–26, 136–41. Wernberg-Møller, however, over-emphasized the similarity with the rabbinic doctrine of the two-*yetzers* and underemphasized the predestinarian outlook of the TST, and therefore came to a very different conclusion than that presented here: “It is significant that our author regards the two ‘spirits’ as created by God, and that according to IV,23 and III,17–18 both ‘spirits’ dwell in man as created by God. . . . That [רוּחוֹת] is used here as a psychological term seems clear; and the implication is that the failure of man to ‘rule the world’ is due to man himself because he allows his ‘spirit of perversion’, that is to say his perverse and sinful propensities, to determine his behaviour” (p. 422). J. Licht, on the other hand, stressed absolute predestination and overplayed the dualism of the text, minimizing the struggle that occurs within the sons of light; “Analysis,” 91 n. 13, 94, 98.

149 Macaskill also properly recognizes both the future sense of the phrase and the manner in which it looks back not to Adam *per se* but to Eden; cf. Macaskill, *Union with Christ*, 138.

TST (and the Hodayot) may capitalize on the ambiguity of the noun, אָדָם, in its ability to evoke Adam and the conditions to which he had access but also to anticipate the fulfillment of human destiny in the condition of a newly created humanity.¹⁵⁰ George van Kooten comments:

Since the ‘configuration of man’ was dual from the outset (Col. IV 20–21), when God placed two spirits in Adam (Col. III 17–18), it seems to be only the latter-day Qumranic Adam who has the evil spirit ripped out ‘from the innermost part of his flesh’ (Col. IV 20–21); to him belongs ‘all the glory of Adam’, i.e. a glory exceeding the still limited glory of the first Adam.¹⁵¹

This commentary rightly captures the manner that the phrase “all the glory of *adam*” is forward-looking, but it also introduces the explanatory notion of degrees of glory, which is alien to the TST. The Treatise does not emphasize that God created a (relatively) glorious Adam, but rather a spiritually conflicted אָנוּשׁ,¹⁵² a humanity which it turns out cannot yet lay hold of the glory God intends for it.¹⁵³ This de-emphasis on original Adam as modelling an ideal ontology becomes even more pronounced in the Hodayot, with its still more radical anthropology. One might hypothesize that incorporation of traditions related to the creation of Adam from dust into the negative assessment of humanity in the TST and the Hodayot frustrates the development or elaboration of a tradition of an initial, ideal human creation. In the TST the apparent lag in the creation of the anthropological conditions immediate to the fulfillment of God’s high intentions for humanity can only be attributed

150 Translators have puzzled over whether to gloss אָדָם as the proper name “Adam” or the generic “human.” For instance, Wise, Abegg, and Cook: 1QH^a IV 27, “glory of man (*or* Adam),” IV 39, “human covenant”; 1QS IV 23, “glory of Adam”; CD III 20, “human honor”; *The Dead Sea Scrolls*, 172–73, 122, 54.

151 George H. van Kooten, *Paul’s Anthropology in Context: The Image of God, Assimilation to God, and Tripartite Man in Ancient Judaism, Ancient Philosophy and Early Christianity*, WUNT 232 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008), 20.

152 Collins argues that this is a clear case of אָנוּשׁ meaning “Adam”; cf. Collins, “In the Likeness,” 610–12. Instead, at this point, the TST appears to adhere to texts like Gen 1:27 and Ps 8:6–7 (E: 5–6) which are not clearly limited to Adam as opposed to humankind. In the HB, אָנוּשׁ may parallel אָדָם but only, it seems, when the latter has its generic sense (cf., e.g., Isa 13:12; 56:2; Ps 144:3). So there is little support for taking אָנוּשׁ as a reference to “Adam,” although Adam must be included in it.

153 Likewise, William Loader observes, “When hope is expressed in 1QS/1Q28 5.15 [sic] as inheriting ‘all the glory of Adam,’ this does not appear to be interpreted as reversing the effect of a fall”; *Dead Sea Scrolls*, 250 n. 59.

to the “mysteries of his knowledge” (1V 18; cf. III 23) and his “glorious design” (III 16). Thus one can understand the “everlasting covenant,” in 1QS IV 22–23, as God’s commitment to his creative intention for humanity.

The terms in which the *adamic* ideal is expressed in the laconic statements of 1QH^a IV 26–27 and 38–40 can now be better understood. The primary association this ideal conjures up is *life*, again expressed by a variety of metaphors drawing on tropes that describe a good (“abundant”) mortal life (l. 26). Specifically, the כבוד אדם results in רוב ימים (ל-). Moreover, the phrase “covenant of *adam*” can be readily explained if the thought of the TST may be supposed: ברית אדם expresses God’s commitment to bring about the conditions which will allow for the fulfillment of God’s intention for humankind, despite the present apparent neglect of that intention implied by God’s creation of a “spirit of flesh” (רוח בשר) whose subjugation is partly to nefarious spirits (ll. 35–37; cf. 13–20). The elect one looks with anticipation toward God’s intention to fulfill all the glory of *adam* in himself and the members of the movement. God’s establishment of the sect is in fact a signal of his commitment to bring about a humanity who can fulfill God’s creative intention for it.

In the second text reflecting a positive use of *adamic* traditions, the psalmist’s description of the experience of election draws on traditions related to the image of God and the edenic splendour enjoyed by Adam. Following directly on a classic *Niedrigkeitsdoxologie* (1QH^a v 30–32, cited above), this text sets a positive use of *adamic* motifs immediately following the negative man-of-dust motif.

[33] Only through your goodness ³⁴ can a person be righteous, and by [your] abundant mer[cy] By your splendour you glorify him (בהדרך), and you give [him] dominion [with] abundant delights (תפארתו), together with eternal ³⁵ peace and long life. For [and] your word will not turn back. (1QH^a v)

Although without explicit reference to אדם, this section is relatively rich in allusions to Gen 1:26–30 and its ideological co-text, Ps 8.¹⁵⁴ God “glorifies” (פאר) the elect “by” or “with” his “splendour.” The word הדר is used to describe the glory and splendour with which God crowns the humanity made a little less than אֱלֹהִים in Ps 8:6 (E: 5). Next, God gives to the elect “dominion” with abundant “delights.” The word מַשֵּׁל, “to rule,” is commonly used in this period, as it is in Ps 8:7 (E: 6) (and 1QS III 17–18), in place of רָדָה in God’s command to “rule” the earth in Gen 1:28. “Delights” is the word עֵדֶן, which is used with the

154 Connections to prophetic eschatology are made below.

same root for “glorify,” פאר, in xvi 21 to describe the community of the elect metaphorically as the Garden of Eden. The divine favour also entails “eternal peace for long life,” implicitly contrasting the mortality that inheres in the fleshly humanity described in the immediately preceding lines. As in the preceding psalm (col. iv), where an “inheritance in all the glory of *adam*” is said to issue in “long life” (להנחילם בכול כבוד אדם לרוב ימים, iv 27), here too “glory” (פאר) and eternal life are brought into association. Such traditions likely reflect the understanding that creation in the image of God anticipates the possession of incorruptible life (Gen 1:26–27; cf. Wis 2:23). The fashioning of Adam in the likeness of God’s glory in the *Words of the Luminaries* probably stands in the same tradition (יצרתה בדמות כבוד[כה], 4Q504 8 recto 4).¹⁵⁵ And the fashioning of a “people of spirit” (עם רוח) “according to the pattern of the holy ones” (כתבנית קדושים, 4Q417 1 i 16–17) in 4QInstruction is probably modified here, insofar as the psalmist—in distinction to 4QInstruction—confesses to being at present a “spirit of flesh.”¹⁵⁶ Finally, we might venture to suggest that the “word” (דבר) of God which is the ground of the psalmist’s assurance in the final colon is in fact the same “word” expressed in Gen 1:26–30 and Ps 8. This would be of a piece with that commitment expressed in col. iv, “to the whole covenant of *adam* I will look” (ואל כול ברית אדם אביט, iv 39). It is noteworthy that all these traditional links look backward to exalted depictions of humankind in creation. Our psalmist, however, had just looked backward (1QH^a v 30–32) and was horrified by what he saw in the dust-man of Gen 2:6–7. The result is

155 It need not be assumed that this text refers to a supernatural possession of glory which is subsequently lost. The language of being formed “in the likeness” most likely indicates that Adam is a copy and the mention of glory shows that Gen 1:26–27 is being read in the light of Ezek 1:26–28, where the glory of God has the likeness of a human form. 4Q504 only indicates that the image in which Adam is created is the (human-like) image of God’s glory. It is not at all clear that glory is a creaturely property of Adam’s that can be lost. A loss of glory, however, is inferred by van Kooten, who however does not go so far as Fletcher-Louis; cf. van Kooten, *Paul’s Anthropology*, 14–8, 21–22; Fletcher-Louis, *All the Glory*, 92–95. James R. Davila, *Liturgical Works*, ECDSS (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000), 245, also sees a loss of glory implied. Conversely, Macaskill’s conclusions are congruent with those presented here: *Union with Christ*, 139.

156 What difference is to be attributed to Adam’s fashioning in the pattern of God (so 4Q504) or angels (so 4QInstruction) is hard to say, and whether the Hodayot is closer to one tradition than the other cannot easily be determined. Perhaps significant in this connection is that the present psalm describes the elect as אנשי חזונוכה (“persons of your vision,” vi 18), which recalls the חזון ההגרי (“vision of meditation”) which is given to those who are patterned after the holy ones in 4QInstruction. But pointing in the opposite direction might be the superior status to the angels described in the “Self-Glorification Psalm.”

to problematize the high intentions signalled by the creation of humankind in Gen 1:26–30 and Ps 8 by the state of human ontology established in Gen 2:6–7. But the psalmist is confident that God will bring about the higher destiny that seems corollary to what is predicated of humankind in the former texts.

In the final text-group in which anthropogonic traditions are used to speak of an exalted humanity, the psalmist describes the community and himself, its leader, metaphorically *as* and dwelling in a functioning Eden. The most elaborate example of this theme is XVI 5–28, but many of its motifs are expressed more concisely here:

¹⁵ Thus all the nations will acknowledge your truth and all the peoples your glory, for you have brought [] your secret counsel (סודכה) ¹⁶ to all the people of your council (עצתכה), and in a common lot with the angels of the presence (ובגורל יחד עם מלאכי פנים), without an intermediary between them *lq*[to]reply ¹⁷ according to the spirit. For [] *td b* and they repent because of your glorious command, so that they become your princes (שריכה) in the [eternal] *lo*[t (ל) בגורל] and] their [shoot] ¹⁸ opens as a flower [blooms, for] everlasting fragrance, making a sprout (נצר) grow into the branches of an eternal planting (מטעת עולם). And it will cast shade over all the world, and its br[anches] ¹⁹ will reach to the clouds, and its roots as far as the deep. All the rivers of Eden (וכול נהרות עדן) [make] its [br]an[ches m]oist and it will (extend) to the measure[less] seas... ^[20] [and] the spring of light will become an eternal ²¹ fountain (והיה מעין אור למקור עולם), without lack. (1QH^a XIV)¹⁵⁷

The primary metaphor is of the planting (מטעת) and the shoot, “sprout” (נצר), while the “Edenic” motif is introduced into the picture in order to supply a source of water (namely, “rivers”) for the trees of the planting. These rivers appear to be associated with a spring of light that is to become an eternal fountain (ll. 20–21). The scriptural source of this planting metaphor appears to be Isa 60:21 and 61:3,¹⁵⁸ which describe the eschatological transformation of

¹⁵⁷ Cf., too, col. xv 21–24, with emphasis on the leader.

¹⁵⁸ Note especially נצר and מטע in 60:21, “They are the shoot that I planted.” On the scriptural background and tradition-history of the term in the DSS, cf. Patrick Tiller, “The Eternal Planting in the Dead Sea Scrolls,” *DSD* 4 (1997): 312–35; Paul Swarup, *The Self-Understanding of the Dead Sea Scrolls Community: An Eternal Planting, A House of Holiness* (London: T & T Clark, 2006), 14–49; Michael A. Daise, “Biblical Creation Motifs in the Qumran Hodayot,” in *Dead Sea Scrolls: Fifty Years after Their Discovery: Proceedings of the Jerusalem*

the once beleaguered Israel into the glorified (פֶּעַר)¹⁵⁹ planting of the LORD, and this is confirmed when the context of each text is compared. The same metaphor of the planting and the shoot is developed, in a sometimes confusing manner, at great length in col. xvi, but with a more thorough identification with the Garden of Eden as depicted by Ezekiel 31.¹⁶⁰ The psalmist writes concerning the “shoot” (נֹצֵר) which becomes an “eternal planting” (מִטְעָה, l. 7) that “you, [O G]od, have hedged in (שָׁכַתָּה) its fruit by means of the mystery of the strong warriors 13 and spirits of holiness, and the whirling flame of fire (לֹהֵט אֵשׁ) (מִתְהַפֵּכָה), so that no [stran]ger might [come] to the fountain of life (מַעְיֵן חַיִּים), nor with the eternal trees (עֲצֵי עוֹלָם) 14 drink the waters of holiness, nor bear its fruit with the plantation of heaven (שַׁחֲקִים).” This transparent allusion to God’s setting (וַיִּשְׁכֵּן) the cherubim (הַכְּרֻבִּים) at the east of Eden to guard (לְשָׁמֹר) the way to the “tree of life” (עֵץ הַחַיִּים) in Gen 3:24 allows the author to associate his marginalized community’s access to privileged knowledge with the luxuries of Eden. Doubtless in part by the recognition that God “planted a garden in Eden” (וַיִּטֵּעַ יְהוָה אֱלֹהִים גֶּן־עֵדֶן, Gen 2:8),¹⁶¹ the Isaianic motif of the “planting,” which concerned Israel’s restoration, is read with the mythological decor of Eden and transferred to the community of the speaker. Three motifs interlock in this third text-group with the Edenic planting.

One is worship with the angels.¹⁶² The angelic guard which is set upon the plantation in col. xvi 12–14 supplies a ready association between Edenic

Congress, July 20–25, 1997, ed. Lawrence H. Schiffman et al. (Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 2000), 293–305.

- 159 This word appears 10 times in the second half of Isaiah to describe the glorification of Israel or of God in Israel in the restoration; outside Isaiah the texts closest to this use are Ps 149:4 and Ezra 7:27; the word also appeared above in the related text of 1QH^a v 33–35 and as a noun in the extended use of the planting metaphor in col. xvi 21.
- 160 Cf. Terje Stordalen, *Echoes of Eden: Genesis 2–3 and Symbolism of the Eden Garden in Biblical Hebrew Literature* (Leuven: Peeters Publishers, 2000), 431.
- 161 Cf. George J. Brooke, “Miqdash Adam, Eden and the Qumran Community,” in *Gemeinde Ohne Tempel*, ed. Beatte Ego, Armin Lange, and Kathrin Ehlers, WUNT 118 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1999), 293.
- 162 On life with the angels in the scrolls and Hodayot, cf. Angel, *Priesthood*, 23–170; Collins, “The Angelic Life,” 291–310; Wold, *Women, Men and Angels*; Esther Chazon, “Human and Angelic Prayer in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls,” in *Liturgical Perspectives: Prayer and Poetry in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls, Proceedings of the Fifth International Symposium of the Orion Center for the Study of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Associated Literature, 19–23 January, 2000*, ed. E. Chazon, STDJ 48 (Leiden: Brill, 2003), 35–47; Björn Frennsson, *In a Common Rejoicing: Liturgical Communion with Angels in Qumran* (Uppsala: Uppsala University, 1999); Deborah Dimant, “Men as Angels: The Self-Image of the Qumran Community,” in *Religion and Politics in the Ancient Near East*, ed. Adele Berlin (Bethesda, MD: University

existence and angelic communion. Communion with the angels can hardly be clearer than in the text first quoted. The members of the council share a lot (בגורל יחד עם) with “the angels of the presence” (מלאכי פנים, xiv 16). The phrase refers to the angels who stand before God without a mediator, and appears in a similar context twice in The Rule of Blessings (1QSb iv 24–26).¹⁶³ The added statement that the people of God’s council “become your princes in the [eternal] לו [t]” (ויהיו שריכה בגורל עולם) (l. 17) could be read as denoting a position that ranks even higher than that of the angelic counterparts of the elect.¹⁶⁴ The plantation is also described in 1QS viii 5–10, which emphasizes the liturgical element; angelic communion is incorporated into the theme in 1QS xi 7–9. Additionally, 4Q174 i 1 6 refers to a מקדש אדם, which offers the familiar ambiguity of the כבוד אדם phrases and the attendant scholarly uncertainty as to its significance. However, if one prominent line of interpretation is correct, the text should be considered as belonging to the same constellation of traditions that project motifs of primal humanity on to the destiny God decides upon for the elect.¹⁶⁵ Of course, communion with the angels is prominent throughout the Hodayot, and not only in these texts concerned with the plantation.¹⁶⁶

Press of Maryland, 1996), 93–103; Maxwell J. Davidson, *Angels at Qumran: A Comparative Study of 1 Enoch 1–36, 72–108 and Sectarian Writings from Qumran* (London: T & T Clark, 1992).

163 Cf. Holm-Nielsen, *Hodayot*, 114; Menahem Mansoor, *The Thanksgiving Hymns* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1961), 143.

164 שר denotes a position at the top of a hierarchy, whether tribal, political, militia, priestly (Ezra 8:24–29; 10:5; 1 Chron 15:22; 24:5; 2 Chron 36:14) or angelic (Dan 10:13, 20, 21; 12:1; cf. 1QH^a xviii 10, (המה אתה שר אלים, 4Q381 i 10–11 might support the interpretation of human exaltation above the angels; so Fletcher-Louis, *All the Glory*, 98–100. For discussion, cf. Schuller, DJD xi, 96.

165 Cf. Swarup, *Self-Understanding*, 108–31; Brooke, “Miqdash Adam”; Michael O. Wise, “That which Has Been Is that which Shall Be: 4QFlorilegium and the מקדש אדם,” *RevQ* 15 (1991): 103–32.

166 Recently Harkins has proposed that the theme of communion with angels played a key role in the editorial shaping of 1QH^a, showing a crescendo effect beginning in the Teacher Psalms and then into the second block of Community Psalms; cf. Harkins, “A New Proposal.” See also Esther Chazon, “Lowly to Lofty” and eadem, “Liturgical Function.” Qimron’s reconstruction of the scroll, *Hebrew Writings*, 1:xxvi, puts an emphasis on exaltation to angelic rank right at the beginning thereof. Critical in the evaluation of a crescendo effect is the placement of frags. 10 and 12. However, communion with angels may also be detected in vi 16–17 (cp. xi 22; xxv 26–27). Moreover, the almost entirely missing final columns of 1QH^a further complicate this hypothesis.

Knowledge, quite naturally, belongs in the constellation of Edenic motifs that emerge within the metaphor of the eternal planting.¹⁶⁷ In col. XIV 15–17 (cited above), the people's participation in God's council was associated with their participation in the lot of the angels of the presence, who need no mediator between themselves and God. "Counsel/council" (עצה and/or סוד) is naturally associated with knowledge (cf. Job 15:8),¹⁶⁸ as the abundance of terms relating to cognition in the immediately preceding lines confirms: "teaching them according to your command (וכפיכה להורותם) 13 and establishing them in your counsel (בעצתכה), according to your proper truth (וכיושיר) for the sake of your glory. And for your own sake you have acted to magnify the teaching (לגדל תורה) and [] / 14 the people of your counsel (אנשי עצתכה) in the midst of humankind that they may recite (לספר) for everlasting generations your wonderful deeds, and they [medi]tate (יש[ווחו]) on [your] mighty acts 15 without ceasing." Participation in the divine council here entails instruction in God's command and truth, and is oriented toward functions that are both outward (recitation) and inward (meditation). The linkage of knowledge with Eden, though natural, is not unproblematic, since on the surface, the narrative of Gen 2–3 implies God's intention to restrict rather than share with the human pair a knowledge which can be described as divine (cf. not only Gen 3:5 but 3:22). However, it may not be the knowledge of good and evil *per se* with which the text is concerned and which in keeping with Gen 2–3, according to the TST, is now the possession of humankind (1QS IV 25–26). The knowledge which is here prized gains rather than restricts access to the plantation, or even causes the plantation to grow (cf. XVI 11–14, above). Knowledge, in fact, is accessed in the teaching of the psalmist. In the extended plantation/Eden metaphor

167 On knowledge in the scrolls and the Hodayot, cf. Eric Montgomery, "A Stream from Eden: The Nature and Development of a Revelatory Tradition in the Dead Sea Scrolls" (PhD diss., McMaster University, 2013); Berg, "Religious Epistemologies"; Alex P. Jassen, *Mediating the Divine: Prophecy and Revelation in the Dead Sea Scrolls and Second Temple Judaism*, STDJ 68 (Leiden: Brill, 2007), 363–75; Elliot R. Wolfson, "Seven Mysteries of Knowledge: Qumran E/Sotericism Recovered," in *The Idea of Biblical Interpretation: Essays in Honor of James L. Kugel*, ed. Hindy Najman, JSJSup 83 (Leiden: Brill, 2004), 177–213; Newsom, *Symbolic Space*, 77–90, 209–17, 273–86; Markus N. A. Bockmuehl, *Revelation and Mystery in Ancient Judaism and Pauline Christianity*, WUNT 36 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1990), 42–51; Jean de Caebel, "La connaissance religieuse dans les Hymnes d'action de grâces de Qumrân," *ETL* 38 (1962): 435–60.

168 Distinguishing between עצה and סוד is difficult, as distinctions in BH are breaking down ("counsel" vs. "council," respectively) in the sectarian literature; cf. John E. Worrell, "עצה: 'Counsel' or 'Council' at Qumran?," *VT* 20 (1970): 65–74; Sigmund Mowinckel, "Some Remarks on Hodayot 39:5–20," *JBL* 75 (1956): 272–73.

of col. xvi the psalmist intones, "But you, O my God, have put in my mouth (words) like early rain for all [] and a spring of living water which does not fail" (l. 17). The psalmist elaborates on "hidden things" (מחובאים) which "bubble forth in secret (בסתר)" and "become waters of con[tention]" (l. 19). One group of trees "in flames of fire . . . whither" but "the plantation of fruit trees [] eternal [so]urce becomes a glorious Eden (לעדן כבוד) and [an everlasting] splen[dour] ([ופא]רת עד)" (l. 21). The knowledge to which the psalmist's teaching gives access effects a stark division between those who meet judgement and those who are identified with the conditions of Eden. The lifting of the prohibition of knowledge for the Edenic community may again signify that what is pictured is not simply a restoration of what original humanity enjoyed—they were restricted from knowledge—but rather the bringing about of the perfection of humanity, here portrayed picturesquely not so much as a glorified Adam, but Eden itself.

A third motif that emerges in relation to the plantation metaphor likewise crystallizes in the extraordinary experience of the teacher himself,¹⁶⁹ who embodies in a seemingly highly personal and unique manner the conditions of light and life which are characteristic of the Edenic situation of the community. At the beginning of the psalm already referred to above, involving the extended garden metaphor, the author may have referred to himself "as" (*beth essentiae*?)¹⁷⁰ the spring of life: "you have placed me as (?) the source of streams in a dry land, (by) a spring of water in a thirsty land" (במקור נוזלים) (1QH^a xvi 5); in any case, the teaching which flows from his lips is so identified (l. 17). In another text, the psalmist apparently describes himself as the plantation: "upon] your [overflowing] kindness I wait, in order to bloom like a plant (להציץ כמטע), and in order to make a shoot grow" (xv 21–22). At the conclusion of this same psalm, the psalmist becomes

169 Classically identified as the Teacher of Righteousness; for studies on the personality of the figure in the ("Teacher") psalms, cf. Douglas, "Teacher Hymn"; idem, "Power and Praise," 319–50, 399–403; James H. Charlesworth, "An Allegorical and Autobiographical Poem by the Moreh Ha-Sedeq (1QH 8:4–11)," in *"Sha'arei Talmon": Studies in the Bible, Qumran, and the Ancient Near East Presented to Shemaryahu Talmon*, ed. Shemaryahu Talmon et al. (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1992), 295–307; Philip R. Davies, "History and Hagiography: The Life of the 'Teacher' in Hymn and Pesher," in *Behind the Essenes: History and Ideology in the Dead Sea Scrolls*, BJS 94 (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1987), 87–105; Jeremias, *Der Lehrer der Gerechtigkeit*.

170 Cf. Daise, "Creation Motifs," 304; Charlesworth, "Autobiographical Poem," 296, n. 4; John W. Yates, *The Spirit and Creation in Paul*, WUNT 251 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008), 72. Alternatively, the *beth* may simply be locative, just as the one which follows two words later.

a focal point of the divine light: “I shine forth with sevenfold light (והופעתי באור) (לכבודכה) *b* [י¹⁷¹] you have established (me) for your glory (שבעתים). For you are an eternal light (מאור עולם) to me, and you set my feet upon level [ground]” (ll. 27–28). While the terminology of the “sevenfold light” is most closely paralleled in Isa 30:26, one can detect two additional scriptural matrices within which this motif operates. One can think, of course, of Gen 1:3–5 and/or of Moses’ illuminated countenance in Exod 34:29–35. The following texts, which share the strong emphasis on the individuality of the psalmist, resonate with the latter context: “you], O my God, have made my face shine (האירותה פני) for your covenant” (XI 4), and “you have illumined my face (האירותה פני) for your covenant . . . I seek you, and as sure as dawn (כשחר נכון), you appear to me as early [li]ght (לי) (למאור) [תי]ם הופעתה (לי) (XI 6–7).¹⁷² However, a pair of texts redirect our attention to that mysterious light of creation: “all the rivers of Eden . . . move streaming over the world without end, and as far as Sheol [and] the spring of light (מעין אור) will become an eternal fountain, without lack” (XIV 19–21); and “for by yo[ur] insight [you have instructed me]and by your glory my light shines forth (ובכבודכה הופיע אורי). For light from darkness you cause to shine (כי מאור מחושך האירותה) (XVII 26–27). The Rule of Blessings (1QSB) IV 24–28, which combines the themes of teaching, illuminated face, and priestly blessing, strongly suggests that this light be read in the context of that light which is associated with God’s holy dwelling and which the TST (1QS IV 6–8) associates with the primordially intended destiny of humankind. Finally, confirming this reading is the text of Isa 30:26 itself, which possibly refers to the seven day light of creation, as distinct from the light of the sun (cf. Gen 1:3, 14).¹⁷³ The tradition of enjoying primordial light expresses the “glory of *adam*,” here described as part of the splendours of Eden. The psalmist(s) likely thought that Adam, Moses (cf. 4Q504 6 10–12 with 8 *recto* 4), and the members of the community (exemplified by the teacher) each experienced the light of

171 The completion of the lacuna here with some reference back to the light (cf., e.g., Fletcher-Louis, *All the Glory*, 105, reflecting a widespread hypothesis) is rejected in DJD XL, 208 on the basis that the traces following the *beth* cannot be an *aleph*. By contrast, Qimron, *Hebrew Writings*, 1:80–81, indicates the *aleph* is almost certain and reconstructs, באור אשר ה[כינותה], in which case the object (“me”) supplied in the translation of DJD XL would be negated. This only makes explicit what one might deduce in any case, that the psalmist is drawn into the light of God’s own glory.

172 Cf. DJD XL, 160–61 on the imagery in this text.

173 Cf. Jacob Milgrom, “The Alleged ‘Hidden Light,’” in *The Idea of Biblical Interpretation: Essays in Honor of James L. Kugel*, ed. Hindy Najman and Judith Hood Newman, JSJSup 83 (Leiden: Brill, 2004), 43.

creation, which is here identified as God's own light (esp. 1QH^a XVII 26–27; cf., too, Ps 36:10 (E: 9); 104:1–2; Isa 60:19–20).¹⁷⁴

More clear than the discussion above might indicate is the role of God's spirit in bringing about the *adamic* glorification. In 1QH^a IV 38–40 the purifying effect of God's spirit was closely associated with the *ברית אדם* and in V 35–36 the reception of the spirit entails knowledge and confidence in God's bringing to fruition an *adamic* glorification of the elect. It is regularly thought that the typical language with which spirit-giving in the Hodayot is expressed—*נָתַן + בִּי*—derives from Ezek 11:19; 36:25–26,¹⁷⁵ but Ps 51:12–14 (E: 10–12) is also likely to stand in the background (cf. XII 30–31 + 32–34). Both contexts concern new creation (*ברא, חדש*) and associate spirit-giving with purification.¹⁷⁶ The less typical means of expressing this gifting of spirit—being poured or spread *על* “upon”; cf. 1QH^a IV 38 and XV 10—yields, in one instance, a fascinating intertextual relationship with Gen 2:7 and 1:1–5: “And over the dust you have spread [your holy] spirit” ([קודשכה] רוח ועל עפר הניפותה רוח 1QH^a XXIII 29–30). At first glance, the text reminds one of God's breathing (*וַיִּפֶּחַ*) breath into Adam, but the image here is different. God does not “breathe in” (*נָפַח + ב*) the spirit but rather “spreads over/upon” (*על + נוף*).¹⁷⁷ The image is more like the description of the spirit of God “hovering over the face of the waters” (*מְרַחֶפֶת עַל־פְּנֵי הַמַּיִם*),

174 This is clearly a multivalent image that allows for the presence both of Adamic and Mosaic associations. Unlike Paul (cf. 2 Cor 3:7–4:6), the covenanters would have had no motivation to distinguish the underlying reality reported in these traditions and scriptural subtexts. Cf. Andrei A. Orlov, “Vested with Adam's Glory: Moses as the Luminous Counterpart of Adam in the Dead Sea Scrolls and the Macarian Homilies,” in *From Apocalypticism to Merkabah Mysticism: Studies in the Slavonic Pseudepigrapha*, JSJSup 114 (Leiden: Brill, 2007), 327–43. For a comparison of Paul and the scrolls, cf. Joseph A. Fitzmyer, “Glory Reflected on the Face of Christ (2 Cor 3:7–4:6) and a Palestinian Jewish Motif,” *Theological Studies* 42 (1981): 630–44, who only by failing to cite 1QH^a XV 21–22 and XVII 26–27 can say, “the medium of illumination is, indeed, not the glory of God, as it is in 2 Corinthians 3–4” (640).

175 Yates, *Spirit and Creation*, 64–84; Levison, *Filled*, 202–17; Carol A. Newsom, “Flesh, Spirit, and the Indigenous Psychology of the Hodayot,” in *Prayer and Poetry in the Dead Sea Scrolls and Related Literature: Essays in Honor of Eileen Schuller on the Occasion of Her 65th Birthday*, ed. Jeremy Penner, Ken M. Penner, and Cecilia Wassen, STDJ 98 (Leiden: Brill, 2012), 339–54.

176 Newsom argues that “this holy spirit is not something that he possesses by right of birth but is external to his original status”; “Flesh, Spirit,” 349; cf., too, Levison, *Filled*, 185–88, 203.

177 *נוף* does not appear in the HB in any of those contexts which describe the spirit coming upon a person, although the image is clearly related (cf., too, 1QH^a IV 38; XV 10). Instead, it is used to speak of “wielding” a tool “upon” something (Exod 20:25), of “waving” a hand

Gen 1:2), about to exercise creative will over the unformed and unfilled earth (cf. 111 29; XV 35; XXI 30). The next broken line refers evidently to transportation from (or transformation of) the mud (טִיט)¹⁷⁸ to the heavenly communion (l. 30). Two broken lines follow, but they carry on from Gen 1:2: “and there is no return (תשיבת) of darkness” (l. 31) “and the light you have revealed and not to return [darkness]” (l. 32). These lines likely refer to human association with the light of creation or even of God’s very own being.¹⁷⁹ The following lines, 33–35, recapitulate the same themes, confirming the interconnection of these thoughts despite the lacunae. In particular, note l. 33: “your [h]oly [spirit] you have spread forth in order to atone for guilt.” These lines profoundly express the creative function of God’s spirit to bring about a new human creature who is cleansed from the sinfulness of *adamic* humanity and enjoys eternally the splendour of heavenly glory (cf., too, 1QS IV 20–23; 6–8).

Thus, next to the *adam*-of-dust motif, the Hodayot introduce the *adam*-of-glory. Despite the Hodayot’s single reference to *adam*’s glory, symbols of primordial abundance, such as light, life, and Edenic splendour, coalesce with traditions which can be tied to *adam* as created in the image of God (Gen 1:26–27) or a little less than *elohim* (Ps 8) in order to associate humanity with the divine or angelic life. Nevertheless, the tension within this anthropology does not fit the pattern of creation-fall-restoration,¹⁸⁰ and the tradition is distorted when the relatively rare term “the glory of *adam*” is thought to encapsulate the most significant anthropogonic reality in these traditions. Instead one finds in the TST, for example, intention-beginning-history-fruition, and the Hodayot appear to cohere with this schematic by the persistent depreciation of the *adam*-of-dust and flesh vis-à-vis the glorious destiny God has in mind for elect humanity. Like Adam, the sectarians were already able in some way to

(2 Kgs 5:11; cf. 1QH^a XVI 23–24, 34; 1QM XVII 9), or of “waving” an offering over the altar (Exod 29:24; Lev 23:11; 11Q19 XV 11 et al.).

178 Cf. the different reconstructions of DJD XL, 277 (בִּטִּיט) and Qimron, *Hebrew Writings*, 1:97 (וִי צִר טִיט).

179 Light and the absence of darkness are referenced in the beginning lines of the column, likely near the beginning of the psalm, where the light is specifically God’s and “set up from of [old]” (ll. 2–4). The psalm continues with references to a human personality being “magnified” “in your glory” (l. 9) and being “glorious” “among the divine beings” (l. 23).

180 Though the terminology/conceptuality is very much present in recent discussion of the Hodayot; cf. Fletcher-Louis, *All the Glory*, 87–112; Yates, *Spirit and Creation*, 74; Hultgren, *Covenant*, 437, 438 n. 69. Contrast Loader, *Dead Sea Scrolls*, 250; and Holm-Nielsen, *Hodayot*, 274–77, despite some equivocation on p. 277. There is now no support for the notion that “the fall” is referenced in XVII 31, as suggested by Wallenstein, as cited by *ibid.*, 161 n. 11.

share in that glory, but *his* creation from dust is still experienced as an obstacle which threatens to destabilize *their* communion with heaven. The tension is an expression of a predetermined design, whose beginning in time (*adam-of-dust*) already looks forward to an end-time ideal (*adam-of-glory*). We shall now see if one of the most profound depictions of an exalted human being in Second Temple Judaism can be comprehended within the same anthropogonic motifs of *adam's* glory—this account is found in the Hodayot's "Self-Glorification Psalm."

The Anthropology of Glory and the Self-Glorification Psalm

The most striking articulation of divine/angelic status in the Hodayot is found in the so-called "Self-Glorification Psalm" (1QH^a XXV 34–XXVII 3; 4QH^a/4Q427 7 i + ii; 4QH^b/4Q428 21; 4QH^c/4Q431 = 4Q471^b),¹⁸¹ but the nature of the claims made and the identity of the speaker herein occasion much disagreement.¹⁸²

181 For the precise column and line numbers of the psalm in 1QH^a, cf. DJD XL, 292, 300–301. It is just possible that 4QH^a 7 ii contains a new psalm, to be distinguished from the "Self-Glorification Hymn" in col. i, but the reasons the editor has given against it are sufficiently compelling; cf. Eileen M. Schuller, "A Hymn from a Cave Four Hodayot Manuscript: 4Q427 7 i+ii," *JBL* 112 (1993): 607.

182 Bearing in mind that most have given precedence to the 4Q491 material in making their identification, the following interpretations can be noted. As far as I am aware, García Martínez is the only one to have proposed a separate identification for the Hodayot copies and the War Scroll related material in 4Q491; cf. Florentino García Martínez, "Old Texts and Modern Mirages: The 'I' of Two Qumran Hymns," *ETL* 78 (2002): 321–39. For the Hodayot he favours the identification of the speaker as the Teacher of Righteousness, whether in actuality or *in memoriam* (cf., too, Abegg, "Who Ascended" and Wise, "A Study"), and for the material in the eschatological war tradition, he favours the identification as the archangel Michael. In the latter position, he comes to the defence of the much-maligned identification made originally by the editor, Maurice Baillet (DJD VII, 29–35); for a response to García Martínez, cf. Brian Schultz, *Conquering the World: The War Scroll (1QM) Reconsidered*, STDJ 76 (Leiden: Brill, 2009), 29–30 n. 67. Morton Smith, who is famously thought to have decisively refuted Baillet's view, proposed that the speaker was a member of the community who had experienced a mystical ascent into heaven; cf. the essay originally given in 1972, Morton Smith, "Ascent to the Heavens and Deification in 4QM^a," in *Archaeology and History in the Dead Sea Scrolls*, ed. Lawrence H. Schiffman and Yigael Yadin (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1990), 181–88; a revised version was published in, idem, "Two Ascended to Heaven—Jesus and the Author of 4Q491," in *Jesus and the Dead Sea Scrolls*, ed. James Charlesworth (New York: Doubleday, 1992), 290–301; and for the problems of considering this an ascent text, cf. Alexander, *Mystical Texts*, 86–89; and against such a reading, John J. Collins, *The Scepter and the Star: Messianism in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 2nd ed. (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2010), 160–63. Another prominent view has been to see in the speaker the eschatological high priest; cf. Esther

Interpretation is hampered somewhat by the uncertain relationship between the Hodayot material and very similar statements found within a bundle of fragments edited as 4Q491, the relevant fragment, number 11, carrying its own unresolved questions of textual relationship to the whole.¹⁸³ Some consideration will be made of expressions only preserved in 4Q491 11 in order to account for the possibility that their absence from the Hodayot is due to the poor preservation of the textual remains,¹⁸⁴ as seems likely in at least a few cases.¹⁸⁵ Here I will seek to demonstrate that the claims made for the different persons (both the “I” and the “you”/“we”) of the Self-Glorification Psalm are both expressive of the archetypal anthropology with which this chapter has been concerned; additionally, the anthropological character of these claims, particularly those made for the singular voice, will further be demonstrated

Eshel, DJD XXIX, 424–27 and John J. Collins, “A Throne in the Heavens: Apotheosis in Pre-Christian Judaism,” in *Death, Ecstasy, and Other Worldly Journeys*, ed. John J. Collins and Michael A. Fishbane (Albany, NY: State University of New York Press, 1995), 43–58; Collins appears less certain of this identification in idem, *Scepter*, 163–64. Émile Puech identifies the speaker as the Teacher of Righteousness/eschatological priest-prophet who reports his own mystical experience or is represented posthumously as experiencing the reward of the resurrection from the dead; Émile Puech, “L’hymne de la glorification du maître de 4Q431,” in *Prayer and Poetry in the Dead Sea Scrolls and Related Literature: Essays in Honor of Eileen Schuller on the Occasion of Her 65th Birthday*, ed. Jeremy Penner, Ken M. Penner, and Cecilia Wassen, STDJ 98 (Leiden: Brill, 2012), 377–408. For the view that the speaker adopts a priestly persona and reports on his experience in the liturgical life of the community, see below, and for the view that the speaker is Enoch, cf. n. 191.

183 In “Who Ascended,” Martin Abegg argued that 4Q491 consists in fact of three separate manuscripts: 4Q491^a (=the War Scroll, known from Cave 1), 4Q491^b (eschatological war material, not identical to 1QM), and 4Q491^c 11 i + 12 (including, the “Cantic of Michael” and “Cantic of the Righteous”). The separation of manuscript *c* from *b* was challenged by García Martínez, “Mirages.” And it is now reported that Abegg has retracted from this distinction; cf. Joseph L. Angel, “The Liturgical-Eschatological Priest of the Self-Glorification Hymn,” *RevQ* 96 (2010): 590, n. 23.

184 The predominant conceptuality used to relate the two textual traditions of this psalm has been literary; they have been considered as two recensions, with disagreement about which might be first. The only objection to this conceptuality that I am aware of comes from García Martínez, who understands them as two instantiations of the same genre, with no necessary literary connection (cf. *Mirages*). I have tried to heed the criticisms made by Schuller (DJD XXIX, 102) and García Martínez (*Mirages*, 114–18) about the failure to respect the different contexts of the textual remains of this psalm.

185 For a graphical comparison of the Hodayot material and 4Q491 11, cf. Schuller, “A Hymn,” 626; and the now dated Devorah Dimant, “A Synoptic Comparison of Parallel Sections in 4Q427 7, 4Q491 11 and 4Q471B,” *JQR* 85 (1994): 157–61.

in the manner that they bring together topoi from scriptural narratives of self-deification and the Isaianic tradition of the Servant of the LORD.

The argument presented here builds on the work of others. For instance, Crispin H. T. Fletcher-Louis detects in the psalm "the autobiography of one who is both human and yet divine."¹⁸⁶ Fletcher-Louis thinks it likely that the speaker was a priest, whose extraordinary experience of transformation occurred within the context of the liturgical life of the community. In Fletcher-Louis' treatment, the claims made by the "I" of self-exaltation appear to be commensurate with the traditions of glorification in the Hodayot he earlier related to the "pre-lapsarian" Adam whose "every glory" is accessed in the community.¹⁸⁷ Joseph Angel, likewise, argues that the speaker is a priest, or at least adopts a priestly persona, and "is to be understood as a present member of the community who, by means of liturgical experience, has undergone an extraordinary transformation." He contends, furthermore, that "the homology drawn between the speaker and the righteous worshipers implies that he leads them to an experience of heavenly glorification comparable to his own."¹⁸⁸ Whereas in 4Q491 11 the self-exaltation and the call for the community to praise God appear to be two separate psalms, in the Hodayot they appear as one psalm, confirming the case for a correspondence between the two parts.¹⁸⁹ Angel, like Michael Wise before him, points out common features predicated of the single and plural referents in the psalm(s), including the claims of exalted heavenly status, suffering, and access to divine knowledge.¹⁹⁰ While the priestly-anthropological nature of the claims made has thus been maintained in certain scholarship, it would appear that these claims could still be more clearly demonstrated as being expressive of the Hodayot's *adam*-of-glory tradition by a simple method of topicalization and comparison. In this way it will be demonstrated that while the speaker adopts a priestly persona, he does so to express the broader anthropological vision of the Hodayot.¹⁹¹

186 Fletcher-Louis, *All the Glory*, 200.

187 Ibid., 104–12.

188 Angel, "Priest," 585, 604.

189 No break falls between the first person paeon and the call to the community to praise God in 4Q427 7 i 13; the same appears to be the case in 1QH^a XXVI 9, whereas in 4Q491 11 12 an exaggerated *lamed* following a vacat appears to mark a new composition; cf. Wise, "A Study," 191–93.

190 Angel, "Priest," 597–98; Wise, "A Study," 216–18. So also Fletcher-Louis, *All the Glory*, 213.

191 The same observation would apply to Enochic elements of the psalm; cf. Christophe Batsch, "Les cantiques d'ascension de Qumrân (4QSelf-Glorification) et le ravissement de Paul (2 Corinthiens 12)," *Hen* 34 (2012): 314–30; Miller, "Reexamined." If the person of Enoch is in the background, then Enoch's experience typifies that of glorified humanity.

The following analysis will juxtapose and consider the relationship between claims made for the “I” in the psalm of glorification, the community in the same psalm, and figures outside this psalm in the Hodayot.

The voice that celebrates his own singular glorification does so by asserting his companionship with the divine beings in the heavenly realm. He refers to himself, apparently, as “beloved of the king (ידיד המלך), companion to the holy ones (רע לקדושים)” (4QH^e 1 6/4QH^a 7 i 10=1QH^a XXVI 6), and asserts, “as for me, my station (מעמד) is with the divine beings (עם אלים)” (4QH^a 7 i 11=1QH^a XXVI 7). These features are matched in the remaining parts of the psalm, where the focus is on the members of the community: They bear the title ידידים (4QH^a 7 i 13=1QH^a XXVI 9)¹⁹² and are located in the “congregation of God” (ב[ע]דת אל), “the tents of salvation” (אהלי ישועה), and “the holy dwelling” ([מעון קודש]), “with the eternal host” (בצבא עולם) and “in common assembly” (ביחד קהל, 4QH^a 7 i 13–18=1QH^a XXVI 9–14); “from the dust” they (i.e., “the poor”) have been raised “to the eternal height and to the clouds” where they are “with the divine beings in the congregation of the community” (עם אלים בעדת יחד), enjoying “eternal joy in their dwellings, everlasting glory without ceasing” (שמחת עולם במבניהם) (4QH^a 7 ii 7–11/4QH^e 2 6–9=1QH^a XXVI 27–30); and yet again, they, “dust and ashes,” have “taken station (להתיצב במעמד) before [God]” and “come into community with the children of heaven” (לבוא ביחד עם בני שמים) (4QH^a 7 ii 16–18=1QH^a XXVI 35–36). Such statements are entirely at home in the Hodayot and need not be rehearsed again.¹⁹³

Membership in the heavenly citizenry naturally involves exaltation and glorification, as already glimpsed immediately above; the more distinctive claims will be marshalled here. A reference to the מלכי קדם (“the kings of the East/yore,” 1QH^a XXV 35) might have been made in the context of the speaker’s claim to have been given the mighty throne they had never occupied, a conjecture based on 4Q491 ii 5.¹⁹⁴ In any case, it is almost certain that somewhere in this

192 The adjective occurs only here in the Hodayot; the equivalent section of 4Q491 ii 13 reads צדיקים, the difference being taken by Wise of the Hodayot redactor’s effort to merge the two canticles into one; Wise, “A Study,” 217.

193 Cf. 1QH^a VI 16–17 (?); VII 17–18; VIII 14–16; XI 21–23; XII 23–24 (?); XIV 15–18; XVI 11–14, 21; XIX 13–17; XX 5–6; XXI 9; XXXIII 26–30; XXV 26–27; and 1QS XI 7–9. See above on “Adam’s Glory and Eden’s Splendours.”

194 The reading would gain in plausibility if frg. 47 could be placed here: cf. Wise, “A Study,” 204–9; Qimron, *Hebrew Writings*, 1:101. Then the next line would begin with a reference to “nobles” (נדיבים, 1QH^a 47 2) which also follows in 4Q491 ii 5. However, Stegemann rules it out, but without stating a decisive reason, and is admittedly tentative in placing it in col. XXII (JDJ XL, 271, 296 n. 8). Puech, “L’hymne de la glorification du maître de 4Q431,” 385 n. 13, also would place it in col. XXII 24–28.

self-description the speaker refers to his having taken a seat in the heavens.¹⁹⁵ The single voice declaims early in his paean, "I exalt myself" (אֲתִרְוַמְמָה 1QH^a xxv 37), according to one reconstruction.¹⁹⁶ He then demonstrates this exaltation prolifically in broken lines that repeatedly ask on different points of comparison who is/has been "like him" (כְּמוֹנִי/דְמָה/שׁוֹה¹⁹⁷); most strikingly, he asks, "Who is like me among the divine beings?" (מִי כְמוֹנִי בְּאֵלִים) (4QH^e 1 4/4QH^a 7 i 8=1QH^a xxvi 4–5) and asserts, regarding some difficult to ascertain subject, "to my glory it will not compare" (לְכַבוֹדִי לֹא יִדְמָה) (4QH^a 7 i 11/4QH^e 1 6–7=1QH^a xxvi 7). This exaltation seems to involve attainment of superhuman capacities, as the speaker boasts, "the utterance of my lips who can sustain? Who in speech is comparable to me?" (4QH^e 1 5/4QH^a 7 i 9=1QH^a xxvi 5–6).

These statements are paralleled, though with less audacity and specificity, in statements relevant to the community. The community is bidden to "sanctify his name with strong lips and a mighty tongue" (4QH^a 7 i 16=1QH^a xxvi 11–12). The boast against the kings is matched by two reversal formulas in which "the lofty assemblies of the eternally proud" are "brought low" (שָׁפַל) and those who stumble and the poor are "raised up" (רוּם) (4QH^a 7 i 19–20, ii 7–9=1QH^a xxvi 15–16, 26–30). The exaltation involves physiological transformation: "he lifts up the poor one from the dust to the eternal height, and to the clouds he makes him tall in stature (וְעַד שְׁחָקִים יִגְבֶּיהָ בְּקוֹמָה) . . . and everlasting power is with their step (וְגִבּוֹרָתָא עַד עַם מְצַעֲדִים) (4QH^a 7 ii 7–9/1QH^a xxvi 27–29).¹⁹⁸ If the single voice can boast of being greater than the *elim*, the plural voices can at least celebrate immediate access to God: the lines are broken, but the point is clear: "There is no mediator (וְאֵין מְלִיץ) to answer at your command . . . and we possess strength to hear wonders such as these [] We speak to you and not to an intermediary (וְלֹא לְאִישׁ בִּינִים) [] And you inclined an ear to the utterance

195 Besides the evidence of 4Q491 11 and the use of frg. 47, there is 4QH^a 6 2, which the editor treats as part of the present psalm (Schuller, DJD xxix, 95); the placement of frg. 6 in the psalm forms part of the rationale for choosing to restore הַיִּשׁוּ [1] in 4QH^e 1 3 (=1QH^a xxvi 4) instead of אֲנִי יִשְׁבְּ[תִי] (so Eshel, DJD xxix, 427) on the basis that "it is unlikely that [the latter phrase] would appear twice in the same section of the psalm" (DJD xxix, 205; similarly DJD xl, 302). Thus, while it is uncertain how many times or where, it can be asserted with some confidence that the psalm describes the speaker's enthronement or taking a seat in the heavenly realm.

196 For the restoration, cf. DJD xl, 296; contrast מְרוֹמִם and רְוֹמִים(?) respectively in Qimron, *Hebrew Writings*, 101, and Puech, "L'hymne de la glorification du maître de 4Q431," 386 n. 16. The reading in question concerns the last preserved line on the right side of frg. 7; the photos make a reading extremely difficult.

197 The presence of the last verb is debated; cf. n. 195.

198 For the combination of being made tall (גָּבַה) to the "clouds," cf. Ezek 19:11; 31:1–14.

of our lips" (4QH^a 7 ii 18–22/1QH^a xxvi 36–41). These are all bold claims on the part of the single and the plural voices.

But they are well prepared for in the Hodayot. The royal status and glorification of the elect (cf. 1QS III 17–18) are implied in v 34 ("by your splendour you glorify him, and you give [him] dominion [with] abundant delights") and vi 16–17 ("that they may do justice [in] the world"); xiv 16–17 speaks of the "princes" (שרים) in the eternal lot, who require no "intermediary" (מליץ) before God. The motif of royal status is combined with personal glorification in xv 25–28: "And you have raised my horn (קרני) above all who despise me . . . My dominion (ממשלתי) (extends) over those who scorn me. For [you,]O my God, have given aid to my soul and have raised my horn on high, and I shine forth with sevenfold light *b*°[] you have established me for your glory." The trope of an extraordinary individual describing his own glorification is amply attested elsewhere, too, with the motif of being lit by (eternal, primordial) light being prominent (xi 4–5; xii 6; xvii 26–28; cf., also vii 12; viii 14; frg. C2 2). In the context of the description of primordial light that appears to shine through the communicative capacities of the worshiper, the motif of *self*-exaltation is pre-saged in xxiii (2–9; 31–32): your servant will "magnify himself in your glory" (ויתגבר בכבודכה, l. 9); and later in the same psalm an implicit comparison with the angels in his company is made: "among the divine beings he is glorious" (בבני אלים יכבד, l. 23; for a similar statement concerning a community, cf. xxv 26–27: "in the council of the ho[ly ones] [they] will be exalted," [קד[ושים] ובסוד קד[ושים]); and, again, in perhaps the same psalm, in the context of "heavenly beings" who are "cast down" from the "holy place" or God's "glorious dwelling" (xxiv 11–12), and where mention of the "bastards" (מזורים, l. 26) is made, there is yet another comparison involving a human with the angels: "you are [ho]noured (or "glorified") more than the sons of God" (ל[ב] ובודתה מבני אל, l. 33–4). Thus the motifs of royal status, glorification, and even self-exaltation (sometimes above the angels) are very closely matched in the Hodayot outside of the Self-Glorification Psalm. The self-glorification of the singular voice is unique only in degree, not in kind.¹⁹⁹

The single voice also admits (sparsely in the Hodayot remains) of being subject to adversity, while also claiming extraordinary prowess as a teacher. In a fragment of what is likely a question, the single voice says, "[Who is/has been] despised like me (נבוזה כמוני)?" (4QH^e 1 i=1QH^a xxvi 2); then, after a line or so, he asks, "[What] will be like my teaching (הוריתי)" (4QH^e 1 3=1QH^a xxvi 3–4).²⁰⁰ The community, likewise, views itself as "those who stumble" (בושלים, 4QH^a 7

199 The same language of degree and kind is used by Collins, *Apocalypticism*, 147.

200 Cf., too, 4Q491 ii 9, cited below, n. 203.

i 19, ii 10=1QH^a XXVI 15, 29) and “the poor” (אֲבִיּוֹן, 4QH^a 7 ii 8=1QH^a XXVI 27), monikers which may be connected to social conflict and isolation.²⁰¹ They are also the beneficiaries of privileged knowledge: They “wait for knowledge” (4QH^a 7 i 20=1QH^a XXVI 15) and they sing at length of possessing it in 4QH^a 7 ii 12–16=1QH^a XXVI 31a–34. The emphasis placed on suffering on the part of the single voice is strong evidence that the person is indeed a human figure. In the broader context of the Hodayot, it bears a striking resemblance to the declaration that introduces the psalms which bear the strong persona of a formative and afflicted leader of the community (1QH^a x–xvii). In col. ix 35, the speaker vows, “And I will recit[e continually] in their midst [i.e., of all God’s creatures] the judgements which have afflicted me.” Thus, the liturgical recitation of suffering which the single voice raises in notes of self-exaltation is matched here, inviting the identification with that formative figure in the history of the community who recites at length his suffering within the Teacher-block of psalms in particular (e.g., 1QH^a x 8–16; xiii 9–11, 17–21, 27–28), though not exclusively (cols. xxi–xxii). Not only is the liturgical recitation of one’s suffering accounted for outside this particular psalm, but so is the association of that suffering with the consequence of the speaker’s glorification. On two occasions this glorification is even portrayed as a type of royal coronation: “the contempt of my foes will become a crown of glory (כִּלְיָ כְבוֹד) for me, and my stumbling, eternal strength” (1QH^a xvii 25) and “You have raised my horn above all who despise me . . . My dominion (extends) over those who scorn me. For [you,]O my God, have given aid to my soul and have raised my horn on high, and I shine forth with sevenfold light” (1QH^a xv 25–28).

Finally, the single voice performs the function of leading a chorus of (heavenly) worshipers in the praise of God. The transition from self-adulation to the imperatives of praise directed at the community (4QH^a 7 i 13=1QH^a XXVI 9) maintains the same implied speaker. The single voice asks, “the utterance of my lips who can sustain? Who in speech is comparable to me?” (4QH^a 7 i 9=1QH^a XXVI 5–6) and then beckons the community, “Sanctify his name with strong lips and a mighty tongue!” (4QH^a 7 i 16=1QH^a XXVI 11–12). The one who celebrated his own exaltation now calls upon the community to praise God for working a similar exaltation on their own behalf. Finally, towards the end of the psalm (4QH^a 7 ii 14ff.=1QH^a XXVI 32ff.), the community itself speaks, as the transition is made to the first-person plural. Throughout all this, worship occurs in community with the heavenly beings, in the very presence of God. This has been the vision for the elect throughout the Hodayot. The following highlights resemble the strong individuality represented in the “I” of

201 Angel, “Priest,” 597.

the Self-Glorification Psalm: “A source of light you have opened[] and for your council you have called me to praise your holiness by the mouth of all your creatures, for you have don[e to be un]ited with the host of eternal [wa]rriors” (1QH^a VIII 14–16 = frg. 13);²⁰² “What am I that . . . you have put thanksgiving into my mouth, pr[ai]se upon my tongue, and (made) the utterance of my lips as the foundation of jubilation?” (1QH^a XIX 7–8); “I have spoken in the congregat[ion of your holy ones, ascribing greatness and wonder to God for yo]u are a God of knowledge. With a [strong] voice [from dawn to evening I will bless your name” (1QH^a XXV 32–33/4QH^b 20 3–4).

The psalm, therefore, permits one to speak of multiple homologies. The words of the single voice are echoed in what is characteristic of the plural voices. The words of both give expression to common themes throughout the Hodayot: communion with the angels, exaltation and glorification, suffering and access to privileged knowledge, and an experience of worship. Each of these themes comes within the orbit of the glory of *adam* (1QS IV 23; 1QH^a IV 26–27) and is properly anthropological. They express the original intended identity of humankind (1QS III 17–18; IV 6–8; 1QH^a V 34–35; XIV 15–18; XVI 11–14, 21), which has been fashioned here by a convergence of royal and priestly qualities, not unlike what one finds in Exod 19:5–6 or Ps 110. But the psalm also gives expression to the discontinuity between this lofty vision and what it knows of the human condition. In familiar fashion, the worshipers intone towards the end: “What is flesh in relation to these things? And how is [dust and ashes] to be reckon[ed] that it should recount these things continually or take (its) station[before you or come into community with] the children of heaven?” (4QH^a 7 ii 16–18=1QH^a XXVI 35–36). The disconnection between the human condition (flesh, dust and ashes [?]) and the human calling (unceasing praise, heavenly standing) expresses the same ambivalence toward humanity that is reflected throughout the Hodayot through the redeployment of traditions of creation and anthropology. At the same time, however, there is perhaps a glimpse of an understanding that the human predicament provides the channel through which God sees fit for humanity to realize its higher destiny. This thought will be explored as we come now to the traditional antecedents behind the singular voice’s self-proclamation.

The claims of the single voice reflect the influence of a number of traditional antecedents. I want to highlight two of them. The first is more widely recognized: the speaker’s self-presentation is shaped by the persona of the Isaianic Servant of the LORD. This is clearest in 4QH^c 11 (=1QH^a XXVI 2) where

202 Qimron disputes the placement of frg. 13 at this point in the reconstruction offered in DJD XL, 38, 110; cf. *Hebrew Writings*, xxx, 106.

the words are preserved [נבוזה כמוני], “despised like me,” reflecting Isa 53:3: “He was despised (נְבוּזָה)” (cf., too, 49:7). The following line of the scroll, preserving the words [וְחָדַל] רע, may be translated “and evil ceases” or “without companion,” carrying on from Isa 53:3: “He was despised *and rejected by men* (וְחָדַל) (אִישִׁים).”²⁰³ The speaker’s own exaltation corresponds to that promised for the suffering servant: “he shall be exalted and lifted up, and shall be very high” (יָרוּם וְנִשָּׂא וְנִבְהָ מָאֵד, Isa 52:13; cf. 53:12). Additionally, the references to teaching (4QH^e 1 3), the “outpouring of lips” (4QH^e 1 4–5), and uniqueness of speech (4QH^a 7 i 9) may reflect the depiction of the Servant of the LORD as a teacher and agent of justice (note the first person in Isa 50:4–9—“the Lord GOD has given me the tongue of a teacher”; also 42:4, 21; 49:2–3), and the expression “beloved of the king” (יָדִיד הַמֶּלֶךְ, 4QH^e 1 6) may reflect the tender affection Yhwh feels for the servant: “Because you are precious in my sight, and honored, and I love you” (מֵאַשֵּׁר יִקְרֶתָּ בְּעֵינַי נִבְבְּדָתָּ וְאֲנִי אֶהְבֵּתִיךָ, Isa 43:4). The adoption of terminology from the Servant Songs is evident in the so-called Teacher Psalms as well,²⁰⁴ whose stark personal claims are most closely matched here.²⁰⁵

The second complex of traditions I want to highlight concern self-deification; these texts have received little attention in relation to the Self-Glorification Psalm, and perhaps not surprisingly, for their protagonists are roundly condemned from the perspective of the authors.²⁰⁶ Before we look at two such texts, it will be well to stress how nearly the speaker in the glorification psalm equates himself to God. The speaker makes numerous claims of super-exaltation, most audacious of which is the question, “Who is like me among the divine beings?” (מִי כְמוֹנִי בָאֱלִים, 4QH^e 1 4=1QH^a XXVI 4–5). This claim effectively makes the speaker second to God and the repeated use of the root דמה (שוה) in the surrounding statements of a similar nature are appropriately close to the form and content of statements with which God is celebrated as without peer or rival. First consider, from Second Isaiah, “To whom then will you compare me, or who is my equal?” (וְאֵל־מִי תִדְמִינִי וְאִשְׁוֶה, Isa 40:25; cf., too, 40:18; 44:6–7; 46:5); or Ps 89:7 (E: 6): “For who in the skies can be compared to

203 Additionally, cf. 4Q491 11 9: [ל רע הדמה ביא] מי יש [א] צערים כמוני ומיא, “Who bears sorrows like me, and who (suffers/lacks) evil like me?”

204 For a judicious weighing of the evidence, cf. Collins, *Scepter*, 145–48; also Jean Carmignac, “Les citations de l’Ancient Testament, et spécialement des Poèmes du Serviteur, dans les Hymnes de Qumrân,” *RevQ* 2 (1960): 357–94.

205 In other respects, the psalm fits better in the category, Community Psalms. For a discussion, cf. Schuller, DJD XXIX, 100–102.

206 Eshel, DJD XXIX, 422 n. 9, considers the comparison with Isa 14:13 only to dismiss it on these grounds.

the LORD? Who among the heavenly beings is like the LORD?” (כִּי מִי בַשָּׁחַק יַעֲרֹךְ) (לִיהוָה יִדְמָה לִיהוָה בְּבִנֵי אֱלִים); and lastly, the nearly exact phrase to that of 4QH^e 1 4 in Exod 15:11: יְהוָה בָּאֵלִים מִי־כַמְכָּה (also 1QH^a xv 31).²⁰⁷ In adopting the same forms of expression in which the uniqueness of God is asserted and by insisting on his exaltation *above* the gods, the speaker comes remarkably close to identifying himself with God.

Of course, the speaker has no designs to supplant, rival, or equal God, and, crucially, the points of his comparison with the heavenly beings are different from those in which God's uniqueness is asserted—the psalmist is neither deliverer nor creator. Nevertheless, the language of self-deification, implying an assumption of new status, calls for comparison with Isaiah's and Ezekiel's portrayals of the kings of Babylon and Tyre.²⁰⁸ It will be seen that motifs of self-deification found therein are recontextualized and transformed in the present psalm by the concept of servanthood as it appears in Isaiah 40–55.

I begin with the *mashal* delivered against the king of Babylon in Isaiah 14:3–23.²⁰⁹ The text records the judgement decreed for a king whose oppressive arrogance is likened to the mythological transgression of having designs on the status of the most high God.

⁹ Sheol beneath is stirred up to meet you when you come; it rouses the shades to greet you, all who were leaders of the earth; it raises from their thrones all who were kings of the nations (הַקִּים מִבְּסֻאוֹתָם כָּל מְלָכֵי גוֹיִם).¹⁰ All of them will speak and say to you: “You too have become as weak as we (גַּם־אַתָּה חָלִיטָ כַּמוֹנוֹ)! You have become like us (נִמְשַׁלְתָּ)! ”¹¹ Your pomp is brought down to Sheol, and the sound of your harps; maggots are the bed beneath you, and worms are your covering.¹² How you are fallen from heaven, O Day Star, son of Dawn! How you are cut down to the ground, you who laid the nations low!¹³ You said in your heart, “I will ascend to heaven (הֲשָׁמִים אֶעֱלֶה); I will raise my throne above the stars of God (מִמַּעַל לְכוֹכְבֵי־אֵל אָרִים בְּסֵאִי); I will sit on the mount of assembly on

207 Cf. Eshel, DJD XXIX, 431, who also notes that the phrase מִי כַּמוֹךְ “is used only in speaking of God” (citing Ps 35:10 and 1QM x 8).

208 Besides the egomaniacal claims made on behalf of these kings of disrepute in the imagination of Israel, the closest biblical precedent one finds for the claims of self-deification in the present Thanksgiving Psalm is found on the lips of Lady Wisdom in Proverbs 8; cf. Collins, *Apocalypticism*, 143–47. There are interesting parallels here, but unlike those of the kings of Babylon and Tyre, the claims of Lady Wisdom do not involve a purported elevation in status.

209 Whether the text can actually be attributed to the 8th century prophet (which raises the question, “why Babylon?”) makes little difference here.

the heights of Zaphon (וְאֲשַׁב בְּהֶרֶם־מוֹעֵד בִּירְכָתִי צָפוֹן);¹⁴ I will ascend to the tops of the clouds (וְאֶעֱלֶה עַל־בְּמֹתֵי עָב), I will make myself like the Most High (וְאֶדְמָה לְעֵלְיוֹן).¹⁵ But you are brought down to Sheol, to the depths of the Pit. . . .¹⁸ All the kings of the nations lie in glory (בְּכָבוֹד), each in his own tomb;¹⁹ but you are cast out, away from your grave, like loathsome carrion, clothed with the dead, those pierced by the sword, who go down to the stones of the Pit, like a corpse trampled underfoot.

Points of contact here with the Self-Glorification Psalm include the juxtaposition of the speaker with kings of yore and reference to their thrones (v. 9); the positioning of the speaker with such kings in an agonistic relationship (vv. 10, 18); a reference to the claimant's own throne and his taking a seat in the realm of the gods (v. 13); the boast of exceeding in status the heavenly beings (vv. 13–14); the likening of oneself with God (v. 14); and the use of the term כָּבוֹד to characterize the claimant's position (v. 18). Before commenting on the transformation of these motifs, I turn to the Ezekielian oracles.

Ezekiel delivers two oracles concerning the prince/king of Tyre (28:1–10; 11–19) that are of present concern. The first records the divine judgement against a king whose wisdom turns to pride and to the accumulation of wealth.

[2] Because your heart is proud and you have said, “I am a god; I sit in the seat of the gods (מוֹשֵׁב אֱלֹהִים יֹשֵׁבְתִי), in the heart of the seas,” yet you are but a mortal (וְאַתָּה אָדָם), and no god (וְלֹא־אֵל), though you compare your mind with the mind of a god.³ You are indeed wiser than Daniel; no secret is hidden from you;⁴ by your wisdom and your understanding you have amassed wealth (חֵיל) for yourself, and have gathered gold and silver into your treasures (וַתַּעַשׂ זָהָב וְכֶסֶף בְּאַוְצְרוֹתֶיךָ).⁵ By your great wisdom in trade (רִכְלָה) you have increased your wealth, and your heart has become proud in your wealth.

Following this, a new oracle (a “lamentation,” קִינָה, 28:12) turns to metaphor as the case against the king is reprised in the hues of the story of the primal couple's rebellion against God.²¹⁰ “You were in Eden, the garden of God,” “the holy mountain of God,” the prophet relays (vv. 13, 14), elaborating in brighter mythic colours the hallucinations of the prior oracle (“I sit in the seat of the gods”).

210 The oracles are closely related; Zimmerli speculates that vv. 1–10 have been secondarily prefixed to the lament (vv. 11–19) “as its obvious justification”; *Ezekiel: A Commentary on the Book of the Prophet Ezekiel*, trans. James D. Martin, Hermeneia (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1983), 73. My language merely reflects the final ordering of the oracles.

“Every precious stone was your covering, carnelian, chrysolite, and moonstone, beryl, onyx, and jasper, sapphire, turquoise, and emerald; and worked in gold were your settings and your engravings” (v. 13). Here the prior description of the great wealth amassed by the king becomes the exuberance of riches in the garden-temple.²¹¹ He has the company of the guardian cherub (v. 14), permitting his access to the holy mountain and its company of beings (“the stones of fire”²¹² vv. 14, 16). But the story cannot end well:

¹⁵ You were blameless in your ways from the day that you were created, until iniquity was found in you. ¹⁶ In the abundance of your trade you were filled with violence, and you sinned; so I cast you as a profane thing from the mountain of God, and the guardian cherub drove you out from among the stones of fire. ¹⁷ Your heart was proud because of your beauty; you corrupted your wisdom for the sake of your splendor. I cast you to the ground; I exposed you before kings, to feast their eyes on you.

These texts likewise reveal points of contact with our present thanksgiving psalm: the claim to divine status (v. 2); the taking of a seat in the company of the divine beings (v. 2, 13–14); the association of treasure and status (vv. 3–5, 13); the celebration of one’s radiance (v. 17); and, again, the agonistic relationship with kings (v. 17). The appearance of the topos of self-deification in these two forms—one originally concerning a celestial being (in Isaiah)²¹³ and the other an apparently human figure²¹⁴—reflects the tendency of the tradition to negotiate human status vis-à-vis the divine through archetypal narratives (cf. Gen 2–3; Job 15:7–8; Ps 8).

The appearance of these traditions of self-deification is made possible because the single voice in the sectarian psalm has adopted the position of servant rather than usurper. In particular, his concept of servanthood appears to be influenced by the depiction of the suffering Servant of the LORD, as indicated above. He boasts in his suffering and his teaching, and thus his glory comes through service to God. He uses his words—to celebrate his own position, yes, but then to summon others to the praise of God, signalling that he

211 The description of the stones corresponds to the notice in Gen 2:11–12 and draws from the description of the high priest’s breastplate in Exod 28:17–20.

212 Cf. Zimmerli, *Ezekiel*, 93.

213 There is uncertainty about whom precisely the myth reflects, but it does not appear to have been a human being; cf. H. Wildeberger, *A Continental Commentary: Isaiah 13–27* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1997), 62–65.

214 On the human identity of the figure, cf. Zimmerli, *Ezekiel*, 90–91.

hints or hopes not to be “*like* (i.e., equal to) God” (that direct claim is absent), but to celebrate his own exaltation as an ode to the mighty acts of God. He has no use for wealth, gold or precious stones, so he only boasts of their absence.²¹⁵ His glory comes by other means. Therefore, the kings of nations cannot claim him as their own, or speak from their thrones and pull him down to Sheol, for his station is altogether different from theirs. If they sought a throne like his, they did not know how to obtain it. They may lie in “honour” (כבוד) in their tombs, but this one celebrates a glory which not even the *elim*, the envy of those dead kings, can match.

Thus, traditions of self-deification that both orbited around primal humanity and are applied derisively against these Gentile kings, have contributed to the positive portrayal of the speaker as coming to fulfill what had earlier been treated as an affront to God—the creaturely appropriation of divinity.²¹⁶ The positive adoption of these myths shows that divinity is incompatible not with humanity *per se*, but only with the attempt to secure or increase it illicitly.²¹⁷ As the myths would instruct: God glorifies the one who accepts their (relative) poverty and brings down the one who grasps at (divine) riches.

These scriptural antecedents combine with the contextual parallels throughout the Hodayot to confirm that the psalm of self-glorification is indeed concerned with the fulfillment of all the glory of *adam*—something which is here understood explicitly in the terms of deification.

Conclusions

The use of anthropogonic traditions in the Hodayot is implicitly dichotomous: on the hand, the *adam*-of-dust motif (Gen 2:6–7) forms the basis for the trope of self-abasement and severely problematizes the enjoyment of the privileges involved in election; on the other hand, traditions which are associated with the creation of humanity after the divine image (Gen 1:26–28) or a little lower than *elohim* (Ps 8) undergird a vision of an exalted, eschatological humanity

215 Not already cited above is the (broken) statement: “not with fine gold I will *koo* for myself, and gold or precious stone not with me” (4QH^a 7 i 12–13=1QH^a XXVI 8–9).

216 It should be noted that in Gen 2–3 itself, Adam and Eve’s disobedience is not treated as an attempt to supplant God, but as a grasping after a good thing from which they were forbidden.

217 “The prince comes to grief precisely on his exalted state and on his splendor. Instead of ennobling him, his beauty makes him ignoble, highhanded, proud of himself. What is a gift, he seizes to himself with greedy hands as his own property”; Zimmerli, *Ezekiel*, 95.

which is able to enjoy the glory intended for it. By putting the two traditions of the creation of humankind in Genesis into tension, the Hodayot seem to reflect a tendency emerging in other texts as well, such as 4QInstruction and the TST.²¹⁸ Consciously or not, however, the sectarian psalmists have exploited tensions which were already latent in their scriptural sources, and they have made them expressive of a divine plan for human beings that includes a temporary frustration of an exalted human destiny by created human ontology.

In the Hodayot, the “glory of *adam*,” therefore, looks back to that which Adam temporarily enjoyed and ultimately forfeited, but it does not hold up Adam *per se* as the model for ideal humanity, insofar as Adam’s earthly ontology frustrates his enjoyment of the heavenly worship. This negative account of human nature indeed capitalizes on ambiguities (or the “secret affinities”) in the Genesis creation narratives, but it is also greatly assisted by two additional traditional matrices, the Joban deconstruction of *adamic* ontology and moral integrity and the equation (also Joban) of the earth and the womb. The duality of the heavenly and the earthly seems to be in operation here (cf. col. IX 11–22), but not construed in terms of absolute difference or an impassable dualism; similarly the category of divinity (or deification), which is applied to exalted humanity, operates not as an all or nothing prospect but in gradations—God is “the prince of the gods, the king of the glorious ones” (שר אלים ומלך נבדלים), 1QH^a XVIII 10; cf. 4Q403 1 31).²¹⁹

218 4Q417 1 i 16–18 does this by dichotomizing the “people of spirit” formed in the “pattern of the holy ones” and the “spirit of flesh” which “did not know the difference between good and evil.” 1QS III 17–18 does this by putting into tension the creation of humankind to rule the world and the constitution of humankind as characterized by two warring spirits, which resemble the two *yetzers*, one of which must be removed prior to the fulfillment of “all the glory of *adam*.” While I have not emphasized it heretofore, a similar technique appears to be at work in 4Q504 8 *recto* 1–10, which narrates the creation of Adam in the image of God’s glory but then appears to recount Adam’s disobedience. In the latter part, an addition to the biblical narrative is made which in the present light appears to be very significant. In alluding to the decree of Gen 3:19 (“you are dust, and to dust you shall return”), the broken text reads, “he is flesh, and to dust.” The inclusion of בשר goes beyond the biblical narrative and emphasizes the connection between dust and flesh in such a way as to problematize human ontology with greater emphasis than Genesis.

219 Here I modify Fletcher-Louis’ concept of divine anthropology which is set within a cosmological framework which in my estimation too far collapses the earthly-heavenly distinction and makes little use of the concept of gradations in divinity; cf. *All the Glory*, 1–32, 253–79. For deification within a concept of graded divinity, cf. Litwa, *Transformed*, 239–49.

Thus, Adam's expulsion from the garden and the sentence of death are comprehended in terms of Adam's creation from the earth and are ultimately rationalized as expressive of the mysterious divine will of an all-powerful figure—God, the creator of all things.²²⁰ In this tradition, Adam maintains his identification with *everyman*; he has not become “a stranger to our condition,” as Ricoeur worried. The terminology of fall-restoration must be so heavily qualified in this framework as to have little value.

I now put the findings of this chapter into the form of answers to the three questions I described in Chapter 1.

What is the purpose and destiny of humankind as relayed in association with traditions of creation? The high calling to which the psalmists believe themselves elected is unmistakable. These psalms relay an experience and expectation of worship with the divine beings (often “gods”) that includes knowledge of divine mysteries, immortal life, and glorification. The anthropogonic basis of this high calling might be somewhat less obvious—perhaps for two reasons: first, it is easy to be impressed by the radical negation of the self in the Hodayot, the destruction of the creature of dust; second, precisely because creation is not perceived as a single event from which a fall altered the course of history but an unfolding destiny, the anthropogonic basis for a high anthropology is only obliquely intimated. These exalted motifs, however, represent the fulfillment of the original intended destiny of humankind, which is confirmed by the faint recollection of Adam's partial experience of them and their broad rootedness in traditions of creation and anthropogony.

How is human creatureliness evaluated from the perspective of this purpose; is humanity innately equipped to fulfill it? The dominant tendency in the Sektarian Psalms is to disparage human creatureliness. They see the conditions of mortality, impurity, and sin as entailed necessarily or innately in creation from dust. Precisely because of the high anthropological expectations of the psalms, these conditions or qualities have become fundamentally problematic. A mortal creature cannot praise God eternally, a creature subject to innate sexual

220 Cp. the conclusions of Loader, who notes the paradox of self-deprecation and divine creation more clearly than most: “It is not resolved by attributing human sinfulness to a primeval fall by Adam or by angels, or to evil spirits, nor by alleging contaminating influence from some external force such as Belial . . . nor . . . does ‘flesh’ depict a sphere of evil power.” Rather the “framework of thought” that makes such a paradox possible is “theistic predestination”; *Dead Sea Scrolls*, 250, 251. And Lichtenberger: “Die Diastase zwischen seiner Vorfindlichkeit, die von seiner schöpfungsmäßigen Niedrigkeit konstituiert wird, und dem Wissen um seine wahre Bestimmung ist die Grundbedingung, die den Menschen ausmacht”; *Menschenbild*, 183–84.

impurities cannot worship the holy God unceasingly, and a creature who sins cannot stand before a righteous judge. Yet these are the privileges entailed in election in the Sectarian Psalms. Their didactic quality and intent, the contraction of the whole scope of human imperfection into its creation, and the mismatch between earthly human ontology and heavenly destiny in these psalms all militate against the view that their base view of human creatureliness is merely an aesthetic effect of their poetic quality or of the feeling of being overwhelmed by the majesty of God. Humankind, having been created from the earth, does not possess the capacities necessary for it fully to enjoy, let alone secure, its own higher destiny. This expresses the basic duality between heaven and earth.

And yet human nature can be purified and the elect do join in the company of the angels already in the worship of the sect; the identification of the sect with the Garden of Eden itself is a picturesque way of indicating its experience of the heavenly life. These experiences are based on traditions related to creation in the image of God or the holy ones, and they indicate that a more positive understanding of human nature also operates at some level within the Hodayot, one which draws the elect into relationship with the divine beings. The Hodayot do not supply the information necessary to define carefully how these two conceptions of human nature relate to each other. It can be said with confidence, however, that the sectarian psalmists felt that as long as they are identified with the *adam-of-dust*, their experience of the heavenly life faces persistent obstacles and is threatened with the same fate that befell Adam.

Finally, what means are provided within the mythology of creation to comprehend negative evaluations of human creatureliness? From the perspective of the psalmists, God created humankind with a destiny which is strained by the constitution of the human being. This intuition is expressed in the TST's pithy statement, "[God] created man to rule the world and placed within him two spirits . . . they are the spirits of truth and of deceit" (1QS III 17–19), and it gives rise to the *Niedrigkeitsdoxologien*, which ruthlessly deconstruct the *adam-of-dust*. The tension between election or calling and human creatureliness is not indicative of a lack of foresight or power on God's part, nor is it attributed to the contingencies human free will introduces into creation. Rather, it is a feature of the divine plan which is reflected in the structure of the cosmos and which encompasses all things, including, mysteriously, the temporary reign of evil.

Adam and the Image of God: Anthropogony outside Romans

The investigation into anthropogonic traditions in Paul begins with letters other than Romans. In particular, I use the implication of Gal 3:28 that some aspect of gender inequality established in creation is overcome in Christ as a springboard, to set up a question, the answer to which begins to take shape in 1 Cor 11:7–12 and then is rounded out in 15:45–50. The latter text at the same time moves us on from the image of God, which Adam and his descendants bear, to the image of the heavenly Christ, while 2 Cor 3:18 and 4:4 & 6 introduce a present aspect of assimilation to the heavenly image otherwise missing from the discussion. Philippians 2:5–11 and 3:20–21 help us to address a matter about which we are able only to speculate in earlier discussions concerning the glorious, heavenly image of Christ, namely, pre-existence, and 1 Cor 15:20–28 begins to focus on the moral-vocational corollary of being God's representatives which will become prominent in Romans.

The leitmotif of this chapter is the image of God. I shall make the following arguments. Paul assumes that creaturely ontologies established in creation continue to operate and have normative status for life in the present body. The image of God describes a somatic condition that unequally relates male to female. The image is best comprehended within the framework, not of fall and restoration, but of the duality of heaven and earth, which is inferred from Gen 1 and reflected in the very act of creation in the image of God (vv. 26–27). That same duality typologically indicates God's intention for humankind as conformation to the heavenly image of Christ. Despite the basic integrity of this ontology, it is exposed to the adverse effects of a morally and vocationally deviant subject, making Christ the only means whereby God's intention for humankind and creation can be fulfilled.

Male and Female No Longer: Galatians 3:28

Galatians 3:28 constitutes the clearest "Adam-reference" in the letter to the Galatians, and it brings us face-to-face with the complex issue of the relationship between creation and new creation in this polemical letter. But not everyone recognizes—or comments upon—the apparent allusion to Gen 1:27

(ἄρσεν καὶ θῆλυ ἐποίησεν αὐτούς; cf. 5:2 LXX) at the tail end of three oppositions in Gal 3:28 (“there is no longer Jew or Greek, there is no longer slave or free, οὐκ ἔνι ἄρσεν καὶ θῆλυ”).¹ There are several possible reasons for this. On the one hand, one might question how much weight is to be invested in an allusion to Gen 1:27—if indeed it is there—given that Paul’s main concern appears to be with the first of the three pairs (Jew/Gentile) and that the others are possibly carried over from the purported liturgical tradition Paul is sometimes thought to quote in this passage (cf. 1 Cor 12:13; Col 3:11, which omit the final pair).² On the other hand, the simplest reading of such an allusion involves a negation of a feature of the created order found in a celebrated text describing humankind as the bearers of the image and likeness of God. The text would then upset the familiar category of fall-restoration, which guides so much thinking on Paul and Adam. Even more problematically, it might threaten the biblical claim that the creation was/is “very good” (καλὰ λίαν/דאָר בִּיט) if a feature thereof needs to be overcome in Christ. At the outset, then, Paul confronts us with a text that has the potential to force a re-evaluation of conventional ways of thinking about Adam and creation in his letters. The possible allusion to Gen 1:27 opens up a number of provocative associations; however, given its very allusiveness and its lack of contextual determination, it can only serve as a teaser which will anticipate the full disclosure of Paul’s letters.³

- 1 The last of the three pairs abolished in Christ stands out from the others by employing the conjunction καί rather than οὐδέ (οὐκ ἔνι Ἰουδαίος οὐδέ Ἕλληνα, οὐκ ἔνι δοῦλος οὐδέ ἐλεύθερος, οὐκ ἔνι ἄρσεν καὶ θῆλυ—the difference is masked in some translations, such as the NIV, NAS). As a result, it replicates exactly a phrase in Gen 1:27 and 5:2 (cf. Mark 10:6 par; for ἄρσεν and θῆλυ in different types of coordination: Exod 1:16; Lev 3:1, 6; 15:33). Comparison with the two other instances of this baptismal formula (if it may be called that) shows this alteration to be somewhat unexpected. 1 Corinthians 12:13 has two pairs, coordinated by the conjunction εἴτε (εἴτε Ἰουδαίον εἴτε Ἕλληνα εἴτε δοῦλον εἴτε ἐλεύθερον). Colossians 3:11 has four pairs, the first two coordinated by καί and the last two standing in succession, asyndetically, where—although the parallelism of opposites breaks down in the first case—one is still likely to infer the same grammatical structure (οὐκ ἔνι Ἕλληνα καὶ Ἰουδαίον, περιτομὴ καὶ ἀκροβυστία, βάρβαρος, Σκύθης, δοῦλος, ἐλεύθερος). This shows, moreover, that even if a baptismal liturgy or form is being employed, it was hardly rigid, so that the attribution of some level of intentionality to the shape it takes in Gal 3:28 is not ruled out. The likelihood of a reference to Gen 1:27 is further strengthened by the image-language employed in Col 3:10–11.
- 2 Cf. the reasons set out for believing this to be such a formula in Wayne A. Meeks, *In Search of the Early Christians* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2002), 11–12; this is a reprint of his influential article, “Image of the Androgyne: Some Uses of a Symbol in Earliest Christianity,” *HR* 13 (1974): 165–208. Cf., too, Hans Dieter Betz, *Galatians: A Commentary on Paul’s Letter to the Churches in Galatia*, Hermeneia (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1979), 181–85.
- 3 For detailed summary of the reception of and scholarship on this text, cf. Pauline Nigh Hogan, *No Longer Male and Female: Interpreting Galatians 3:28 in Early Christianity*, LNTS 380

There are three broad ways in which the apparent allusion to Gen 1:27 in Paul's statement that in Christ "there is no longer male and female" has been handled. In the first case, it has often been simply ignored. Scholars who argue that Paul merely wants to affirm the impartiality of God toward male and female in matters of justification have been found in this category, and what relevance a negative reference to Gen 1:27 could have for this view is less than clear, indeed.⁴ Others, however, can be found in this category, including James D. G. Dunn, who generally presents a maximalist construal of "Adam-references" in Paul.⁵

Alternatively, the allusion has been read as signalling a *return* to conditions which initially inhered in creation. The suggestion that a *negation* of a phrase borrowed from Gen 1:27 can signal a *return* to primordial conditions requires some explanation. In a classic article, "The Image of the Androgyne," Wayne Meeks suggested that the pre-Pauline setting of the formula originally reflected "the myth of an eschatological restoration of man's original divine, androgynous image."⁶ In this reading, the "male and female" of Gen 1:27 refers not to a "them" but to a bi-sexed "him,"⁷ and the formula "suggests that somehow the act of Christian initiation reverses the fateful division of Genesis 2:21–22."⁸ Ben Witherington presents a variation of this understanding of the function of the allusion as signalling a return to primordial conditions that does not include androgyny, tentatively suggesting that Paul may be "saying that in

(London: T & T Clark, 2008); Dale B. Martin, *Sex and the Single Savior: Gender and Sexuality in Biblical Interpretation* (Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox, 2006), 77–90.

4 Thomas R. Schreiner, *Galatians*, ECNT (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2010), 259.

5 James D. G. Dunn, "Adam in Paul," in *The Pseudepigrapha and Christian Origins: Essays from the Studiorum Novi Testamenti Societas*, ed. Gerbern S. Oegema and James H. Charlesworth (New York: T & T Clark, 2008), 120–35; idem, *The Epistle to the Galatians*, BNTC (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1993), 205–8.

6 Meeks, *In Search of the Early Christians*, 19.

7 The evidence for such an interpretation of Gen 1:27 cited by Meeks includes Philo, *QG* 1.25; *Opif.* 151f.; and b. Meg. 9a; Mek. Pisha 14; and Gen. Rab. 8:1. In *There Is No Male and Female: The Fate of a Dominical Saying in Paul and Gnosticism* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1987), Dennis Ronald MacDonald argues that Paul is influenced by a Dominical saying later recorded in *The Gospel of the Egyptians* (Clement of Alexandria, *Strom.* 3.13.92); 2 Clem. 12:2; Gos. Thom. 21a–22; 37.

8 Meeks, *In Search of the Early Christians*, 14. Taken as further indication that the formula reflects the *Urzeit-Endzeit* pattern is its use in Col 3:10 ("clothed yourself with the new self, which is being renewed in knowledge according to the image of its creator"), on which cf. n. 209 below. Meeks was followed by Betz, *Galatians*, 195–200. Betz notes, however, that Paul never discusses androgyny in itself, changes his mind by the writing of 1 Corinthians (11:11–12), and drops the matter entirely in Romans.

Christ there is no necessary coupling of male and female.”⁹ Similarly, William Loader suggests that the LXX’s allowance for a distinction “between the man of Genesis 1 and the Adam of Genesis 2” is conducive to an “ultimate hope . . . to return to be as the being in Genesis 1 where male and female aspects are present, but—despite 1:28—are not acted upon.”¹⁰ Such interpretations are plausible but they require a lot of the reader, especially in the case of androgyny, since there is no strongly attested precedent for reading Genesis in this way, at this time. We would be justified in preferring an interpretation which does not have Paul cite and negate a feature of Gen 1:27 in order to envision a return to primordial conditions.

This interpretation is taken up by scholars who have argued that Paul intends a straightforward *undoing* of an element of creation. Rather than reflecting an *Urzeit-Endzeit* formula, the text inserts a wedge between creation and new creation by making the original distinction between male and female an obstacle to be overcome.¹¹ This may be taken to mean different things in terms of the male-female relationship. Judith Gundry-Volf takes this view of the function of the allusion, but she forestalls the possible implication that it entails the end of sex-distinction; rather, “it refers to the adiaphorization of sex difference in a new creation where being male or female is no advantage or disadvantage in relation to God and others and where man and woman are reconciled and united as equals.”¹² In constituting an undoing of some element of creation, this view of the meaning and function of the allusion reflects an understanding of Gen 1:27 according to which the creation of male and female is tied more closely to marriage and procreation (citing 1 Cor 11:7; Gen 1:28) than to the

9 Ben Witherington, *The Indelible Image: The Theological and Ethical Thought World of the New Testament, Volume Two: The Collective Witness* (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 2010), 637.

10 William R. G. Loader, *The Septuagint, Sexuality, and the New Testament: Case Studies on the Impact of the LXX in Philo and the New Testament* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2004), 97, 126. Loader refers to the translation of the ambiguous Hebrew אָדָם as ἀνθρωπος in Gen 1:26–27 and 2:7 but then the proper name Ἀδὰμ in Gen 2:16 and thereafter until 5:5 (cf. pp. 32–35). A similar position is adopted by John M. G. Barclay, *Paul and the Gift*, 396–97.

11 Cf. Edward Adams, “Paul’s Story of God and Creation: The Story of How God Fulfills His Purposes in Creation,” in *Narrative Dynamics in Paul: A Critical Assessment*, ed. Bruce W. Longenecker (London: Westminster John Knox, 2002), 41.

12 Judith M. Gundry-Volf, “Christ and Gender: A Study of Difference and Equality in Gal 3,28,” in *Jesus Christus als die Mitte der Schrift: Studien zur Hermeneutik des Evangeliums*, ed. Christof Landmesser, Hans-Joachim Eckstein, and Hermann Lichtenberger (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1997), 439.

image of God (Gen 1:26);¹³ it also reflects a holistic reading of Gen 1–3 in which features of the created blueprint have become burdens “under the conditions of the fallen creation.”¹⁴

J. Louis Martyn takes the view that some aspect of creation is undone in a somewhat different direction. Paul is not concerned about equality between the sexes, but rather “with a newly created unity.”¹⁵ Believers are “taken into the corpus of the One New Man.”¹⁶ The allusion to Gen 1:27 signals the death of the old cosmic antinomies of religious differentiation (Jew/Greek, Slave/Free, Male/Female) in the cross and announces the appearance of the new creation in Christ (cf. 6:14–15). Paul identifies these antinomies as “the elements of the cosmos” (4:3; cf. v. 9) that have been terminated in Christ (“for neither circumcision nor uncircumcision is anything,” 6:15).¹⁷ “In baptism the structure of the original creation had been set aside.”¹⁸

The simplest construal of a negative reference to Gen 1:27 involves some undoing of a feature of original creation, rather than its restoration, as Gundry-Volf and Martyn recognize. While Paul does not, therefore, work with the logic of creation’s *restoration*, he may, however, work with that of its (intended) *fulfillment*. This possibility has not been sufficiently considered in the literature. In order to begin to see how Paul might imagine both a sort of “undoing” and a “fulfilling,” it is necessary to recognize that “image of God” conceptuality thoroughly imbues this text through the permeation of the themes of sonship and inheritance in the wider context of Galatians. This provides the necessary contextualization for a reference to “male and female” drawn from the account of the creation of humankind in the divine image.

13 Judith M. Gundry-Volf, “Male and Female in Creation and New Creation: Interpretations of Galatians 3:28c in 1 Corinthians 7,” in *To Tell the Mystery: Essays on New Testament Eschatology in Honor of Robert H. Gundry*, ed. Thomas E. Schmidt and Moisés Silva (Sheffield: JSOT, 1994), 108–10. Drawing earlier on Phyllis A. Bird, “Male and Female He Created Them’: Gen 1:27b in the Context of the Priestly Creation Account,” *HTR* 74 (1981): 129–59.

14 Gundry-Volf, “Male and Female,” 113.

15 J. Louis Martyn, *Galatians*, AB (New York: Doubleday, 1997), 377.

16 Ibid.

17 Ibid., 393–406, 570–74; see also the essays “Apocalyptic Antinomies” and “Christ and the Elements of the Cosmos” now reprinted in his *Theological Issues in the Letters of Paul*, SNTW (Nashville: Abingdon, 1997).

18 Martyn, *Galatians*, 375.

The following texts indicate that the language of sonship, and with it inheritance, belong to the same conceptual framework as the image of God:¹⁹

Then God said, “Let us make humankind in our image, according to our likeness; and let them have dominion over the fish of the sea, and over the birds of the air, and over the cattle, and over all the wild animals of the earth, and over every creeping thing that creeps upon the earth.” (Gen 1:26; cf. vv. 28–30)

When Adam had lived one hundred thirty years, he became the father of a son in his likeness (תַּמִּינֵהוּ; LXX ἰδέα, NETS “form,” alt., “appearance”), according to his image (עִלְוָנוֹ; LXX εἰκὼν), and named him Seth. (Gen 5:3; cf. Luke 3:38)

Yet you have made them a little lower than God, and crowned them with glory and honor. You have given them dominion over the works of your hands; you have put all things under their feet. (Ps 8:4–5 [E: 5–6])

For those whom he foreknew he also predestined to be conformed to the image of his Son (συμμόρφους τῆς εἰκόνος τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ), in order that he might be the firstborn within a large family (πρωτότοκον ἐν πολλοῖς ἀδελφοῖς). (Rom 8:29)

[His beloved son . . .] is the image (εἰκὼν) of the invisible God, the firstborn (πρωτότοκος) of all creation. For in him all things in heaven and on earth were created, things visible and invisible, whether thrones or dominions or rulers or powers—all things have been created through him and for him. (Col 1:13, 15–16)

19 Eltester (*Eikon*, 104) points to the confluence of the themes of image and son in Hellenistic literature. He cites Plato's *Tim.* 92c (which relates εἰκὼν τοῦ ποιητοῦ and μονογενής); *Resp.* 6.508; Plutarch, *E Delph.* 21, 393 D (which relate language of the sun as image and then later as son or offspring); *Quaest. plat.* 2.1, 1001 B; 8.4, 1007 C (cosmos as image of God); *Quaest. conv.* 8.1, 718A (God as father of the cosmos); Philo, *Agr.* 51 (logos as firstborn) and *Fug.* 101 (logos as image of God), et al. Incidentally, the connection between “image” and “son” might put the lie to the view of those who hold that Jesus' sonship, but not his being image, relates to his pre-existence. Cf., too, Rudolf Bultmann, *Theology of the New Testament*, repr. (Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2007), 132–33.

[His Son] is the reflection (ἀπαύγασμα) of God's glory and the exact imprint (χαράκτῆρ) of God's very being, and he sustains all things by his powerful word. (Heb 1:2–3)

In these texts, one can see that image-language partly constitutes a filial relationship.²⁰ Genesis 1:26–27 suggests that humankind stands somewhere in that spectrum (note the prepositions ב/ב) of beings (*plural*: “Let us”; “in our image”; cf. Gen 3:22) who belong to the class of *sons* of God (Gen 6:2; Ps 28:1 [E: 29:1]; Ps 89:7 [E: 6]; Job 1:6; 2:1; 38:7).²¹ The filial associations of image of God language elucidate the connection between the image-motif and rule: humankind is granted the world as an inheritance, as of sons from a father. Correspondingly, the sons of God were associated with the heavenly bodies that rule over the earth (Job 38:7).²² That the underlying connection between these motifs is not lost on Paul is confirmed by Rom 8:29, where the language of image and sonship blend together: with the conformation of the elect to the “image of [God’s] Son,” Christ becomes “the firstborn within a large family.”

The wider context of Gal 3:28 is replete with the motifs of sonship and inheritance; it is critical to notice that Paul lends to them a transcendent character. Although Paul’s immediate polemical aim is to establish the Galatians’ proper membership as the seed of Abraham and heirs of the Abrahamic promises apart from their observance of the law (3:5–7), he consistently transcends these categories, or undergirds them by reference to a more fundamental reality. In Christ, *the* seed of Abraham (3:16), the Galatians are not merely τοῦ Ἀβραάμ

20 This has been argued at length by Carly Crouch: “The description of humans as in God’s צלם and דמות in the same terms used to describe Seth’s connection to Adam is an attempt to draw a parallel between the father-son relationship of 5:3, between Adam and Seth, and the divine-human relationship of 1:26–7 and 5:1”; “Genesis 1:26–7 as a Statement of Humanity’s Divine Parentage,” *JTS* 61 (2010): 10. She, however, goes astray on or overlooks a few points: she understands the terminology entirely as metaphor; she does not note its connection to the language of “sons of God” who are summoned in the creation (“Let us,” of Gen 1:26); nor does she note the correlation to Ezek 1:26–28. Had she noted the latter text she might not have discounted the physical sense of the term. In view of that text, it is hard to avoid the implication that image-language in Gen 1:26–27 and 5:1–2 is related to the visible bodily form of the human being, who resembles God as a son does a father. On the bodily aspect of the image, cf. n. 56.

21 On these points, cf. Litwa, *Transformed*, 100–105.

22 In the application of the concept to humankind there is a democratization of ANE kingship ideology. The king as image/son of God claims the earth as his inheritance/possession: Gen 1–3 and Ps 8 bestow that status and claim on humankind itself. Cf. David J. A. Clines, “Humanity as the Image of God,” *TynBul* 19 (1968): 94.

σπέρμα (3:29, the immediate polemical point) but they are υἱοὶ θεοῦ (3:26, the ground and transcendence of the Abrahamic). Through their incorporation into Christ, *the* son of God, the Galatians are adopted into God's family, receive the spirit of God's son, and call on God, not simply Abraham, as ἀββὰ ὁ πατήρ (4:3–6).²³ Likewise, the inheritance or the promise is not what one might expect, land or descendants, but rather the blessing of Abraham, righteousness/justification, or the spirit (3:6, 8, 14, 21). It is not the present-earthly Jerusalem, but the Jerusalem above which has given birth to the Galatians (4:21–31), and which is likely the focus of their inheritance.²⁴

Paul's redefinition of sonship and inheritance in a transcendent manner facilitates the termination of this-worldly distinctions of "Jew or Gentile, slave or free, male and female" to define who is in and who is out or to define a relation of advantage and disadvantage.²⁵ In this context, permeated by the categories of sonship and inheritance, the formally anomalous reference to "male *and* female" can be recognized as evoking the category of image of God (Gen 1:27) and is coherently related to Paul's *new* creation hermeneutic.²⁶

-
- 23 Dunn detects an Adam Christology in these verses, which is certainly not too far-fetched if the image of God motif informs the text; cf. Dunn, *The Epistle to the Galatians*, 214–18: "The purpose of Christ's death was to recover for the 'sons of Adam' the status of 'sons of God' (cf. Luke iii.38)" (p. 218). However, see the section "The Form of God" in this chapter for criticism of the language of "Adam Christology."
- 24 Andrew T. Lincoln, *Paradise Now and Not Yet: Studies in the Role of the Heavenly Dimension in Paul's Thought with Special Reference to His Eschatology*, SNTSMS 43 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1981), 22; in connection with Gal 3:28: p. 24; see the entire chapter on this text (pp. 9–32).
- 25 As Mary Rose D'Angelo notes, the negation of "male and female" is relevant to the illustration of the passage to majority, the attainment of sonship (3:23–25; 4:1–7), for the privilege did not in fact apply to foreigners, slaves, and women under the law. Cf. "Gender Refusers in the Early Christian Mission: Gal 3:28 as an Interpretation of Gen 1:27b," in *Reading in Christian Communities: Essays on Interpretation in the Early Church*, ed. Charles A. Bobertz and David Brakke (Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press, 2002), 158. The "slave/free" opposition has wider resonance as well (cf. 4:1–9, 21–5:1). Brigitte Kahl argues that the termination of male and female is more integral to the argument than usually assumed in that it undermines the importance that could be attached to the distinction between circumcision and uncircumcision; "No Longer Male: Masculinity Struggles behind Galatians 3:28?" *JSNT* 79 (2000): 37–49.
- 26 Cf. Gal 6:14–15: "May I never boast of anything except the cross of our Lord Jesus Christ, by which the world (κόσμος) has been crucified to me, and I to the world (κόσμῳ). For neither circumcision nor uncircumcision is anything; but a new creation (καινή κτίσις) is everything!" Discussion surrounding Paul's new creation language continues to generate debate: Barclay argues that it is primarily, but not exclusively, sociological: *Paul and the*

With the knowledge that “male and female” in this context evokes the category of the image of God, we can comprehend how Paul signals both the undoing of some element of creation and its fulfillment. If we recall that the creation of humankind in the image of God involves humanity in a negotiation of its identity vis-à-vis the divine beings, especially through participation in eternal life,²⁷ then the termination of male and female may signal the transcendence of the earthly strictures or categories which define the *adamic* image in a manner comparable to what Paul has done with the categories of sonship and inheritance. Luke 20:35–36 is pertinent: “But those who are considered worthy of a place in that age and in the resurrection from the dead neither marry nor are given in marriage. Indeed they cannot die anymore, because they are like angels and are sons of God, being sons of the resurrection” (cf. also 2 Bar. 51:7–17). This framework for understanding the termination of “male and female” demonstrates how tricky it can be to determine if the termination of sex and marriage²⁸ or the end of sex distinction *per se*²⁹ is being anticipated.

Gift, 394–96; idem, “Paul, the Gift and the Battle over Gentile Circumcision: Revisiting the Logic of Galatians,” *ABR* 58 (2010): 48 n. 37. Adams argues that it comprehends both cosmic and sociological categories: Edward Adams, *Constructing the World: A Study in Paul’s Cosmological Language*, SNTW (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 2000), 224–28. Whole monographs are devoted to the question.

- 27 When Ps 8 reflects on the finitude and limitations of humankind in comparison to the heavens and asks, “What is man?” the response is “a little lower than *elohim*.” The statement of divine-human relationship in Gen 1:26–27 puts humankind ambiguously “in/after” (less likely, “is”) the image of God. The narrative of Gen 2–3 works this out, with humankind losing the opportunity to ascend the higher ranks of the *elim* or *sons of God* through attaining everlasting life due to its disobedience (though it gets half-way there: Gen 3:22–23), while the remainder of the primordial history shows the first pair’s seed variously transgressing its post-Eden limitations (Gen 6:1–4; 11:1–9).
- 28 The proximity of v. 28 to Gen 1:27 and the subsequent account of Eve’s creation might suggest that Paul has in mind the termination of the normal functions attributed to male and female, which are grounded in creation.
- 29 The citation of Gen 1:27 readily suggests this as well as the androcentricity of the new reality; e.g., πάντες γὰρ ὑμεῖς εἰς [masc.] ἐστε ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ; cf. Martyn, *Galatians*, 377. The term “androcentricity” is preferred to “androgyny” because scholars now tend to consider the latter category as inherently problematic in relation to antiquity. On this point, cf. Martin, *Sex and the Single Savior*, 82–87; Kari Vogt, “‘Becoming Male’: A Gnostic and Early Christian Metaphor,” in *Image of God and Gender Models in Judaeo-Christian Tradition*, ed. Kari Elisabeth Børresen (Oslo: Solum Forlag, 1991), 172–87; Lone Fatum, “‘Image of God and Glory of Man’: Women in the Pauline Congregations,” in *Image of God and Gender Models*, ed. Kari Elisabeth Børresen, 56–137. Note that each of the other pairs in the formula can be interpreted as signalling an end of distinction *per se* and the assumption of

The text from Luke nicely illustrates this ambiguity: marriage ends in the heavenly status of “sons of God.” In any case, we can offer the suggestion that in Christ believers participate in eternal life and the heavenly world, thereby transcending the earthly, mortal instantiation of the image of God, which is comprehended by the term “male and female.”

Galatians does not offer the necessary material to substantiate these claims fully. Nor does it provide the categories to comprehend what happens to the image of God in this participation in the transcendent heavenly realm or why Paul can evoke the concept of the divine image in order to define a relationship of *disadvantage* between male and female, as is suggested by the other pairs in this formula. There is no need to speculate further when the whole Pauline corpus lies ahead of us. In particular 1 Cor 11:7–12 and 15:45–50 will assist us both to define how a relationship of disadvantage might be entailed in Gen 1:27 as well as to substantiate and clarify the suggestion that the image of God is drawn into the conceptuality of the earthly and the heavenly duality.

We conclude that there are good grounds to hear the language of the termination of “male and female” in terms of a reference to Gen 1:27 and creation in the image of God, and we tentatively suggest that it signals the transcendence of the earthly-mortal determination of the image through participation in the heavenly reality made available in Christ. At the same time, we are left to wonder how “male and female” might signal a relationship of disadvantage in terms of the image of God as well as what the termination of “male and female” means in practical terms. Immediately, then, we are plunged into a sea of questions and familiar categories are proving an unfit vessel to navigate the waves. A feature of initial creation is overcome in Christ. “Fall and restoration,” therefore, proves to be an inadequate category to comprehend our first example of a reference to the creation of humankind in the letters of Paul.

the disadvantaged member into the advantaged member in Christ: instead of Jew/Greek Paul can be read to imply that all are Jews (cf. Gal 6:16); instead of slave/free, he in fact argues that all are free (cf. 5:1). Teasing out these elements of the argument would take us too far afield, however. On the other hand, Paul's theology of the body (cf. Rom 12:4–5; 1 Cor 12:12–31) might provide grounds for anticipating the continuation of male and female, except that this theology is specifically conditioned by the present state of the church as it now exists under the kingdom of Christ (1 Cor 15:24–25) rather than the “kingdom of God,” when “we shall be changed” (15:24, 28, 50–52). One should emphasize that in the biblical tradition deity and divine beings are predominately, if not always, male (cf. Gen 6:4; 1 En. 15).

The Gendered Image of God: 1 Corinthians 11:7–12

First Corinthians 11:7–12 picks up where Gal 3:28 left off. In fact, it has been suggested that some among the Corinthians did indeed take the tradition Paul handed on, which is recorded in Gal 3:28, and proceed to obliterate the usual signs of gender distinction (such as head coverings) and patterns of gendered relations (such as sex and marriage, cf. 1 Cor 7), forcing Paul to drop the gender binary from the formula in 1 Cor 12:13.³⁰ While we cannot here speculate on what motivated the Corinthians,³¹ matters of gender and its relationship to the image and glory of God are explicit concerns in the present text. Two reasons why 1 Cor 11:2–16 is a candidate for the most disputed text in the Pauline corpus bear directly on these matters and the riddle of Gal 3:28.³² On the one hand, Paul unblushingly applies the concept of the image of God to the present condition of humankind. This has been an embarrassment to many scholars and theologians who are accustomed to talking about the defaced and especially the lost image of God.³³ On the other hand, Paul interprets the concept of the image of God in categories which have proven to be an embarrassment to modern sensibilities in general: namely, as an inherently bodily and gendered reality which, as Michael Lakey argues and we shall confirm, “presumes the metaphysical, *viz.* intrinsic, inferiority of women.”³⁴ Given these inconveniences it is little wonder the text has proven a thorn in the side of scholars and laymen alike, often generating ingenious exegesis³⁵ or being marginalized

30 Cf. n. 1 above.

31 David Garland provides a summary, which ultimately concludes that “we are left only with guesses”; 1 *Corinthians*, BECNT (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2003), 505–7 (507).

32 Matters that do not impinge on or determine the argument here concern the translation of κεφαλή in v. 3 (literally, “head,” but as “ruler,” “source,” or “pre-eminent”?) and whether a head-covering, veil, or (less likely) long hair is described in vv. 4–6. However, with reference to the first matter, I should note that connotations of differential authority are almost certainly to accrue to the relationship described between the individual members of this hierarchy; cf. the related texts, 1 Cor 14:33–36; 15:27–28; Eph 1:22; 5:22–23; Col 2:10; 1 Tim 2:11–13. On κεφαλή, cf. the extensive overview in Anthony C. Thiselton, *The First Epistle to the Corinthians*, NIGTC (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000), 812–23.

33 Several examples can be found in Chapter 1, in the section, “Issues of Anthropogony in Paul.” Cf., too, Werner Georg Kümmel, *Man in the New Testament* (London: Epworth Press, 1963), 69 n. 78; more nuanced is Udo Schnelle, *The Human Condition: Anthropology in the Teachings of Jesus, Paul, John*, trans. O. C. Dean (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1996), 98–102.

34 Michael Lakey, *Image and Glory of God: 1 Corinthians 11:2–16 as a Case Study in Bible, Gender and Hermeneutics*, LNTS 418 (London: T & T Clark, 2010), 135.

35 For example, arguments which are, *prima facie*, historically and contextually unlikely and yet not uncommon in the interpretive discussion of this text include attempts to

as unclear and limited in scope.³⁶ However, while 1 Cor 11:2–16 is sometimes construed to stand in opposition to Gal 3:28,³⁷ it in fact supplies the presuppositions about the image of God which were hidden in the implied transcendence of inequality between male and female in Galatians, and it proves to hold insights that unlock, clarify, and cohere with Paul's anthropogonic references generally.

Paul's scriptural argument in this text (vv. 7–12, cf. 3) aims to provide cosmological grounds for the maintenance of the signs of gender distinction as construed in an agonistic culture (vv. 4–6), in particular the covering of the woman's head, in the context of the Corinthian community's worship practices.³⁸ The argument is introduced in v. 3 by a general theological principle stating an order of being: "But I want you to understand that the head of every man is Christ, the head of a wife is her husband, and the head of Christ is God."³⁹ That Paul begins with man/Christ (rather than, for instance, Christ/God) shows that he already anticipates his argument for the covering of the woman's head, for each stage in that argument involves a statement of contrast between man (first) and woman (second) (vv. 4–5, v. 7, vv. 14–15). This coheres

deny elements of subordination therein (whether in v. 3 or vv. 7–12); avowals that Paul does not distinguish between man and woman in relation to the image of God (only in terms of glory, v. 7); and the construal of Paul's argument whereby he supports the signs of gender distinction (vv. 4–6) via hierarchical arguments in vv. 7–10, which arguments are then suddenly contradicted by vv. 11–12 (despite v. 3), but the distinctions maintained nevertheless and on new grounds in vv. 13–16. The simplest, most elegant, interpretations of this text are produced by those who place Paul in the (to us, alien and uncomfortable) context of ancient discourse on gender and cosmology and honour and shame; cf., e.g., Lakey, *Image and Glory*; Susan A. Calef, "Kephale, Coverings, and Cosmology: The Impenetrable 'Logic' of 1 Corinthians 11:2–16," *JRSSup* 5 (2009): 21–44; Dale B. Martin, *The Corinthian Body* (New Haven, CT: Yale Univ Press, 1995), 229–49. For theological engagements with Paul that do not by-pass an historically contextualized understanding of his constructions of gender, cf., again, Lakey, *Image and Glory*; also, Benjamin H. Dunning, *Specters of Paul: Sexual Difference in Early Christian Thought* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2011).

36 Recall that Ziesler "disregards" the plain meaning of the text because it does not occur in a "soteriological context" and that Scroggs attributes it to a "lapse" in Paul's thinking; cf. Ziesler, "Anthropology of Hope," 107; Scroggs, *The Last Adam*, 70 n. 3. Cf. "Issues of Anthropogony in Paul" in Chapter 1.

37 E.g., Fatum, "'Image of God and Glory of Man.'"

38 Against Jerome Murphy-O'Connor, "Sex and Logic in 1 Corinthians 11:2–16," *CBQ* 42 (1980): 482–500, who thinks that Paul is equally concerned with male behaviour in this text; Paul's focus, attention, and directives consistently point to the women in the congregation.

39 ESV.

with the fact that the rationale for the covering of the woman's head is her relation to the man.⁴⁰ The setting of the male/female in the context of God/Christ, Christ/male provides the cosmological structure which supports Paul's transition from the discourses of honour and shame (vv. 4–6) to the perspective of scripturally revealed insights (vv. 7–12). Paul will argue that the relationship between man and woman is determined in the order of creation and ought to be reflected in the covered head of the woman, but not the man.

The claim on which the whole discussion turns is Paul's statement that "a man (ἄνθρωπος) ought not to have his head veiled, since he is the εἰκὼν and δόξα of God; but the woman (γυνή) is the δόξα of man (ἀνδρός)" (v. 7). Paul proceeds to expound this statement by reflecting on the creation of woman and man in Gen 1–3. The contrastive conjunction πλὴν in v. 11 signals a development in the argument, and the verse has become the basis for an application of a "new creation hermeneutic" whereby Paul is thought to subvert the argument for male privilege that was grounded on the order of creation in vv. 7–10.⁴¹

Mary Rose D'Angelo and Francis Watson have offered different versions of this reading. D'Angelo understands 1 Cor 11:7–12 to contain two extended interpretations of Gen 1:26, which are in fact antithetical.⁴² In vv. 7–9 Paul establishes an argument for the necessity of head-coverings which interprets Gen 1:26–27 in light of 2:7, and then on the basis of the subsequent creation of Eve (2:18–20 and 21–23) understands her as derivative. In verse 11 Paul rejects this argument, stating what now applies ἐν κυρίῳ: "neither woman without man nor man without woman." Genesis 2:21–23 is now reinterpreted in v. 12 to mean οὕτως καὶ ὁ ἄνθρωπος διὰ τῆς γυναικὸς. In the phrase οὕτε γυνή χωρὶς ἀνδρὸς οὕτε ἄνθρωπος χωρὶς γυναικὸς (v. 11), D'Angelo detects the traces of a rabbinic argument

40 Garland is partly right that "Paul's purpose is not to argue for the subordination or inferiority of the woman" but only insofar as Paul presupposes these things in order to argue that woman should cover her head; Garland, *1 Corinthians*, 523.

41 In addition to those discussed below, cf. Daniel Boyarin, *Radical Jew: Paul and the Politics of Identity* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1994), 193; idem, "Gender," in *Critical Terms for Religious Studies*, ed. Mark C. Taylor (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1998), 123–24. Also Judith M. Gundry-Volf, "Gender and Creation in 1 Cor 11:2–16: A Study in Paul's Theological Method," in *Evangelium, Schriftauslegung, Kirche: Festschrift für Peter Stuhlmacher zum 65 Geburtstag*, ed. Jostein Ådna et al. (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1997), 151–71.

42 Mary Rose D'Angelo, "The Garden: Once and Not Again: Traditional Interpretations of Genesis 1:26–27 in 1 Corinthians 11:7–12," in *Genesis 1–3 in the History of Exegesis* (Lewiston, NY: Edwin Mellen Press, 1988), 6.

(cf. Gen. Rab. 8:9; 22:2; y. Ber. 9:1),⁴³ which applied the phrase to Gen 1:26–27 in order to rule out prescriptions for male and female based on the separate creation of Eve from Adam. “This interpretation proclaims that all are ‘from God’ [v. 12]: all come from God and bear God’s image, as the child is from and like father, mother, and God.”⁴⁴ Having thus defeated the first scriptural argument by the second, Paul must offer new grounds for woman’s head-coverings (hence, vv. 13–16).

An entirely different basis supports a “new creation hermeneutic” according to Francis Watson. He argues that the subordinationist language of vv. 7–9 “outline[s] a problem to which the head-covering is the solution.” That problem is the “asymmetrical construal of eros,” which Paul finds in the creation account itself, according to which woman is an object of erotic attraction.⁴⁵ The “semantic slippage” in the sense of δόξα in v. 7 illustrates this: “man as the manifestation of God should not cover his head, but woman as the object of man’s erotic joy, love and devotion should cover her head.”⁴⁶ The allusions to Gen 2 in vv. 8–9 evoke the decree that it was not good for the man to be alone (Gen 2:18): “When [woman] arrives on the scene, she is greeted with an ecstatic look of recognition . . . that intends and initiates the movement of reunion in which man becomes one flesh with his wife (2:24).”⁴⁷ The head-covering remedies this male oriented asymmetry, and signals the woman’s authority to participate fully and reciprocally with men in the new community (v. 10). “The head-covering he seeks to impose marks the turning-point between the old order of eros and the new order of agape.”⁴⁸

43 The texts were pointed out by Madeleine Boucher, “Some Unexplored Parallels to 1 Cor 11:11–12 and Gal 3:28: The NT on the Role of Women,” *CBQ* 31 (1969): 50–58, who did not, however, make the exegetical argument D’Angelo employs; her purpose was to establish that rabbinic texts, like Paul’s, contain statements that sound “egalitarian” but also like Paul’s had limited impact in the social sphere. Aspects of D’Angelo’s argument are shared by Jervell, *Imago Dei*, 309–12.

44 D’Angelo, “The Garden,” 27. The details are complex, but central to the argument is a distinction between two perspectives on the creation of humankind derived from the plural verb of divine action in Gen 1:26 (“Let us . . .”) and the singular in Gen 1:27 (“God created . . .”). The singular anticipates the unrepeatable events of Gen 2, the creation of Adam and Eve, and the plural looks forward to the participation of male and female in propagating the human race (cf. Eve’s statement that she conceived “with the Lord,” Gen 4:1).

45 Francis Watson, “The Authority of the Voice: A Theological Reading of 1 Cor 11.2–16,” *NTS* 46 (2000): 530–33.

46 Ibid., 531. For this sense of δόξα as “joy, pride” citing v. 15; 1 Thess 2:20; Phil 3:19.

47 Ibid., 532.

48 Ibid., 533.

Besides problems which are inherent to each particular proposal,⁴⁹ central to these interpretations is a problematic appeal to a kind of “new creation” hermeneutic. This hermeneutic is thought to undermine a particular construal of the relationship between man and woman having its basis in the original creation as revealed in Gen 1–2, whether a hierarchy of image and glory or a male-oriented asymmetry of eros. However, signs that vv. 7–10 and 11–12 are in continuity with each other are detrimental to these proposals. An exegesis is provided below, but in summary it can be said that the prepositions of v. 12 seem chosen to accord with v. 8, suggesting that v. 11 does not contradict⁵⁰ but only qualifies what came before.⁵¹ The additional allusion to the narrative of the creation of the woman in v. 12 in order to support v. 11 is poorly chosen if the intent is to contrast creation and new creation, especially given that the formula in v. 12 is compatible with v. 8. Moreover, that the order of being in v. 3, which is introduced as a sort of foundation for the argument, informs vv. 7–9 and finds an echo in τὰ δὲ πάντα ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ in v. 12 suggests that the entire scriptural argument is premised on a hierarchical structure imprinted on creation and applying ἐν κυρίῳ (v. 11).

The argument put forward here is largely in keeping with that of William Loader, who thinks that Paul “is clearly influenced by the stronger emphasis in the LXX on the chain of being,”⁵² as well as Francis Watson himself, who in an article published prior to that discussed above, made the same argument as Loader’s on the basis of the Hebrew text of Genesis and informed by modern

49 D’Angelo makes an impressive argument, but if she is correct about the interpretive assumptions undergirding Paul’s logic, we might rightly wonder if Paul’s intent was to be understood (for he omits to mention the key interpretive details). Likewise, Watson’s argument seems too dependent on the emergence of modern feminism than the cultural contexts of Paul’s time and tradition. Rather, if an interpretation can be offered that appeals to broadly attested assumptions about males and females in antiquity, and does not involve Paul in an argument with himself, it is to be preferred.

50 Often cited here is Hans Conzelmann, *1 Corinthians*, trans. James W. Leitch, Hermeneia (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1975), 190: “The contradiction between v 8 and v 12 seems particularly crass.” Yet he goes on to state that the claim of v. 12 “can be made without prejudice to [woman’s] subordination in principle.” See below on v. 11.

51 Although perhaps particularly Pauline (hence ἐν κυρίῳ), these qualifications are hardly unique, as Lakey notes: “an emphasis upon both hierarchy and mutual necessity between the sexes . . . is uncontroversial,” citing Aristotle, *Pol.* 1.1252a–b and Philo, *Cher.* 125; cf. Lakey, *Image and Glory*, 143.

52 Loader, *Septuagint*, 101. Loader also emphasizes the integration of Gen 2:18–25 with Gen 1:26–27, including the use of ποιήσωμεν in 2:18 (rather than the singular), the introduction of “likeness” in 2:20 (ὁμοιός αὐτῷ), and the use of ἀνθρῶπος in 2:24 instead of ἀνήρ. *Ibid.*, 27–52, 120.

scholarship on the image of God.⁵³ Indeed, Paul's argument as constructed in 1 Cor 11:7–10 appeals to no special features of the LXX *per se*.⁵⁴ Nevertheless, that LXX Genesis can be shown to reflect or encourage such an understanding can be taken to substantiate Paul's doing so as well. On this view, Paul understands the man as male to be the image of God; the woman, being derivative, relates to God through the man, and the details of her creation are read to confirm such convictions and ground her present subordination under the superior ontology and status of the man. Commentators, however, regularly appeal to the implied plain sense of Gen 1:26–27 to assure us that Paul does not wish to make a distinction between man and woman in terms of the image of God, which that text applies to both sexes, but only in terms of glory.⁵⁵ Not only have modern scholars cast doubt on this supposed plain sense of Genesis;⁵⁶ early

-
- 53 Cf. Francis Watson, "Strategies of Recovery and Resistance: Hermeneutical Reflections on Genesis 1–3 and Its Pauline Reception," *JSNT* 45 (1992): 92–99; David J. A. Clines, *What Does Eve Do To Help? And Other Readerly Questions to the Old Testament* (London: T & T Clark, 1990), 25–48; also: Phyllis A. Bird, "Sexual Differentiation and Divine Image in the Genesis Creation Texts," in *Image of God and Gender Models in Judaeo-Christian Tradition*, ed. Kari Elisabeth Børresen (Oslo: Solum Forlag, 1991), 11–34; eadem, "Male and Female."
- 54 Which is not to say Paul nowhere reflects its peculiar emphases; cf. Loader, *Septuagint*, 86–107.
- 55 Thomas R. Schreiner, "Head Coverings, Prophecies, and the Trinity: 1 Corinthians 11:2–6," in *Recovering Biblical Manhood and Womanhood: A Response to Evangelical Feminism*, ed. John Piper and Wayne Grudem (Wheaton, IL: Crossway, 2006), 132–33; Gordon D. Fee, *The First Epistle to the Corinthians*, NICNT (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1987), 515; Craig S. Keener, *1–2 Corinthians*, NCBG (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005), 93 (reflecting, however, more nuance in terms of Paul); Ben Witherington, *Women in the Earliest Churches* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991), 86, also cf. 87 (though without the appeal to Genesis, but stating that *ἀνὴρ* applies to "humanity in general").
- 56 Cf. n. 53 and n. 20. The Hebrew **אֱדָם** of Gen 1:26–27 is potentially ambiguous in the light of the singular in 27b ("in the image God he created *him*") and the events in Gen 2; the reference to "male and female" only in the third of as many parallel clauses (27c) signals a close relationship to what immediately follows (injunction of procreation); and the LXX greatly contributes to this ambiguity. Loader reasons that the LXX's inability to reproduce the pun in Gen 2:7 showing that **אֱדָם** is related to the **אֱדָמָה** makes it easier to read *ἀνθρωπος* in 1:26–27 and 2:7 as "man" rather than "humankind." The translation of Gen 5:1b–2, rendering **אֱדָם** as *Ἀδάμ*, which reprises 1:26–27, provides strong evidence that the translator understands the latter text as a reference to Adam; cf. Loader, *Septuagint*, 32–35, 49–52. Moreover, the suggestion that sex and gender distinctions might bear on a different relationship to the image of God coheres with a growing consensus among NB scholars that the "image of God" corresponds (at least in part) to the bodily constitution of humankind; cf. Benjamin D. Sommer, *The Bodies of God and the World of Ancient Israel* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011), 68–78; Stephen L. Herring,

interpreters of 1 Cor 11:7 regularly understood Paul “as literally affirming men’s *exclusive* God-likeness,” according to the study of the reception of this text by Kari Elisabeth Børresen.⁵⁷ We shall analyze the text and then return to the question of the relationship between woman and image of God, the interpretation of Gal 3:28, and the significance of this text in the broader discussion of image of God in Paul.

Paul’s argument expounds the concept of the image of God in terms of body and gender.⁵⁸ In the context of an argument for the covering of the woman’s head, the appeal to the image and glory of God in order to ground a distinction between the sexes plainly suggests as much—the challenge is to make sense of it. The distinction between the man and the woman in the covering of the head corresponds to a distinction in their relationship to God and to

“A ‘Transubstantiated’ Humanity: The Relationship between the Divine Image and the Presence of God in Genesis 1 26f,” *VT* 58 (2008): 480–94; Andreas Schüle, “Made in the ‘Image of God’: The Concepts of Divine Images in Gen 1–3,” *ZAW* 117 (2005): 1–20; John Goldingay, *Old Testament Theology*, 3 vols. (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 2003), 1:102–3; G. von Rad, *Old Testament Theology*, 2 vols., OTL (Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 2001), 1:144–46; Hermann Gunkel, *Genesis*, trans. Mark E. Biddle (Macon, GA: Mercer University Press, 1997), 113.

- 57 Kari Elisabeth Børresen, “God’s Image, Man’s Image? Patristic Interpretation of Gen 1,27 and 1 Cor 11,7,” in *Image of God and Gender Models in Judaeo-Christian Tradition*, ed. Kari Elisabeth Børresen (Oslo: Solum Forlag, 1991), 199–200. She adds further: “Augustine is the *first* church Father I have found who directly affronts 1 Cor 11,7 by stating that women *too* are created in God’s image. . . . Augustine neutralises Paul by explaining that god-like man signifies the superior element of the human soul, which is dedicated to contemplation of eternal truth; in contradistinction to non-God-like woman, who represents the soul’s inferior element and is charged with earthly matters. . . . Creational gender hierarchy is a self-evident premise of this reasoning, with corollary disparity between femaleness and God-likeness. It follows that human female beings are theomorphic *in spite* of their bodily sex, whereas men’s spiritual *imago Dei* corresponds to their exemplary maleness. Exclusion of femaleness at the divine level remains basic in Augustine’s God-language” (*ibid.*, 200). Thus, even when Augustine affirms the female’s participation in the image of God, he does so through an allegorical exegesis which (as was common) understands the image of God in terms of the soul rather than the body. Cf., too, Kari Elisabeth Børresen, “God’s Image, Is Woman Excluded? Medieval Interpretation of Gen 1,27 and 1 Cor 11,7,” in *Image of God and Gender Models*, ed. Kari Elisabeth Børresen, 208–27; Vogt, “Becoming Male.”

- 58 The somatic orientation of the image of God in Paul has been stressed recently by Lorenzen, *Eikon-Konzept*; but she unfortunately pays little attention to this text (cf. p. 255). It does fit awkwardly with her stress on attainment of the image through confirmation to the image of Christ, by which she lends the image a soteriological rather than (also) creational basis.

each other: a man ought not to cover his head εἰκὼν καὶ δόξα θεοῦ ὑπάρχων,⁵⁹ but woman δόξα ἀνδρός ἐστίν (v. 7). That Paul seizes on the term δόξα to build his contrast between man and woman is important for the implications of his understanding of εἰκὼν because it emphasizes the visible, which is important in a context concerned with the comportment of the body. Δόξα is also effective since it serves both to evoke the agonistic language which preceded (vv. 4–6; also vv. 13–15)⁶⁰ and to exegete εἰκὼν (or less likely ὁμοίωσις, Gen 1:26) in a manner that prioritizes the man's relationship to God over the woman—he is the image and glory of God, woman is the glory of man. While “glory” does not mean “reflection,” it can pick up that connotation where it is used in connection with image terminology.⁶¹ It is the head of the man which is not to be covered, perhaps because the reflection is most clearly concentrated or seen there (specifically, in the face). 2 Enoch 44:1 illustrates the logic: “The LORD with his own two hands created mankind; in a facsimile of his own face, both small and great, the LORD created them.” Thus, the man is a reflection, i.e., revelation, of God's glory, while the woman reflects that of the man.⁶² When sexual difference relates men and women differently to the “image and glory of God” its gendered connotations are inescapable.⁶³ After following the course of Paul's scriptural-theological argument in vv. 8–12, we will return to this claim.

-
- 59 Paul's focus on the gendered aspect of εἰκὼν might have something to do with the omission of the preposition κατὰ (found in Gen 1:26–27; 5:1, 3 LXX; Sir 17:3; Col 3:10; Jas 3:9; omitted in Wis 2:23), for the point is to speak directly to the asymmetrical relationship of man and woman to the image and not (yet) to expound the creation of humankind *per se*. We shall see that Paul distinguishes between an earthly and heavenly image, reflecting this kind of distinction.
- 60 Δόξα is well attested in this sense, but see its use directly in parallel to agonistic language in 2 Cor 6:8; Phil 3:19; and already in 1 Cor 11:13–14.
- 61 Conzelmann, *1 Corinthians*, 187. Cf. the emphasis on seeing and revelation in 2 Cor 4:4, 6; cf. Heb 1:3; Wis 7:26.
- 62 Following the argument put forward by A. Feuillet, “La dignité et le rôle de la femme d'après quelques textes pauliniens: comparaison avec l'Ancien Testament,” *NTS* 21 (1975): 157–91; and idem, “Homme ‘gloire de Dieu’ et la femme ‘gloire de l'homme,’” *RB* 81 (1974): 161–82, Thiselton contends “that this has nothing whatever to do with any supposed ‘anti-feminism’ in Paul, for this differentiation is defined in terms of greatness and glory, not inferiority”; Thiselton, *First Corinthians*, 835. This is badly misleading: is man as “glory of God” not inferior to God?
- 63 The agonistic language of the text can still be heard in δόξα, and it may be that those connotations are to the fore here as well, especially in the case of the woman vis-à-vis the man, if we allow some “semantic slippage”; so Watson, “Authority,” 531; cf., too, Fee, *First Corinthians*, 516.

Paul moves from Gen 1:26–27 to the creation of woman in Gen 2 in order to support (γάρ, vv. 8 & 9) the claim that she is δόξα ἀνδρός. He argues from the order of creation itself; the events of creation reflect eternal truths about the constitution of man and woman. He first alludes to the creation of Eve ἐκ Adam (1 Cor 11:8; cf. Gen 2:23), stating οὐ γάρ ἐστιν ἀνὴρ ἐκ γυναικὸς ἀλλὰ γυνὴ ἐξ ἀνδρός. Then he recalls the reason for Eve's creation as specifically on account of the man (Gen 2:18): καὶ γάρ οὐκ ἐκτίσθη ἀνὴρ διὰ τὴν γυναῖκα ἀλλὰ γυνὴ διὰ τὸν ἄνδρα (1 Cor 11:9). Γυνή is thus both derived from and directed toward ἀνὴρ. These archaic events are archetypal of a constitutional hierarchy of man over woman; this is why he continues to use the generic terms “man” and “woman” rather than “Adam” and “Eve.” Thus Paul, with some justification from Gen 1:26–27, can claim that man is the image and glory of God, but woman the glory of man, for woman, he learns from Gen 2, is derivative of man. After drawing a conclusion⁶⁴ on the matter of head covering on the grounds of the scripturally revealed order of creation in v. 10,⁶⁵ Paul nuances the argument thus far.

64 The conclusion adds little to the present focus. The argument thus far can accommodate either the construal of ἐξουσία as signifying man's authority over woman or woman's own authority. For the latter view, cf. Morna D. Hooker, “Authority on Her Head: An Examination of 1 Cor 11:10,” *NTS* 10 (1964): 410–16; repr. in, eadem, *From Adam to Christ*; for the former view, citing evidence (a single case) for the use of “authority” in a passive relationship to its subject, cf. Schreiner, “Head Coverings,” 135–36. Even if ἐξουσία denotes woman's authority, that it stands in metonymically for “head-covering” or “veil” is proof enough that it does not overturn the argument so far made concerning the constitutional hierarchy established between man and woman. These symbols tend to be mandated in antiquity in the context of androcentrically determined socio-cultural systems, in which the sexuality of the woman is perceived as a threat to male status and control of resources as well as vulnerable on account of the different constitution of the female body to negative spiritual influence. (The latter concern is perhaps reflected in the reference to angels in v. 10.) “Authority” will continue to connote man's authority in this case. On the symbolic significance of head covering, cf. Loren T. Stuckenbruck, “Why Should Women Cover Their Heads because of Angels? (1 Corinthians 11:10),” *Stone-Campbell Journal* 4 (2001): 227–31.

65 διὰ τοὺς ἀγγέλους may mean many compatible things, none of which would decisively shape the present argument: e.g., that angels are the guardians of the created order, participate in the worship of the assembly, or are vulnerable to the woman's sexuality (or hers to them). Cf. the excellent discussion of Stuckenbruck, “Because of the Angels”; also Joseph A. Fitzmyer, “A Feature of Qumran Angelology and the Angels of 1 Cor 11:10,” *NTS* 4 (1957): 48–58.

In verses 11–12 Paul safeguards the previous argument from potential misapplication.⁶⁶ Against too strong a construal of the hierarchical relationship between man and woman, which might be thought to motivate either its termination or its abuse among the Corinthians, Paul stresses that their proper mutual interdependence (οὔτε γυνή χωρὶς ἀνδρός οὔτε ἀνὴρ χωρὶς γυναίκος)⁶⁷ is affirmed ἐν κυρίῳ, that is, in the sphere of salvation effected by Christ.⁶⁸ Paul's argument is buttressed not by anything particularly unique about being in Christ but, again, by creational norms: ὥσπερ γὰρ ἡ γυνή ἐκ τοῦ ἀνδρός, οὕτως καὶ ὁ ἀνὴρ διὰ τῆς γυναικός (v. 12). The statement “man is διὰ woman” carefully preserves and expands the constitutional hierarchy asserted in v. 8 (“man is not ἐκ woman”), emphasizing now woman's necessary role in reproduction,⁶⁹ but also implicitly qualifying the whole argument via a semantic distinction from v. 9 (then: “woman is διὰ the man”; now also: “man is διὰ the woman”). The special emphasis that these interrelationships (interdependence within hierarchy) apply “in the Lord”⁷⁰ insists on their continuing validity in the

-
- 66 Πλὴν has the sense of “however,” “nevertheless,” drawing out a contrary (but not contradictory) direction of the argument; cf. Phil 3:16; 4:14; Rev 2:25. Hence, vv. 11–12 add a qualification; they do not reinterpret what came before but anticipate and correct a potential misinterpretation of what came before by specifying further. The transition is well expressed by L. Ann Jervis, “But I Want You to Know . . . : Paul's Midrashic Intertextual Response to the Corinthian Worshipers (1 Cor 11:2–16),” *JBL* 112 (1993): 245, even if she brings a somewhat different understanding to the argument: “Verse 11 is Paul's reiteration of his previous [orally delivered] teaching that in the Lord men and women find harmonious unity. While Paul has had to recast his basic teaching [in the previous verses] because of his converts' offensive practice of disregarding gender-specific appearance at worship, he nevertheless (πλὴν) affirms that teaching.” Cf. BDF § 449, “Πλὴν means . . . ‘only, in any case’ in Paul, used to conclude a discussion and emphasize what is essential.”
- 67 The translation of the clause is difficult, but that it establishes a relationship of interdependence (most translations supply “independent”; BDAG χωρὶς, “neither (is) woman (anything) apart fr. man, nor man fr. woman”) rather than equality (“man is not different from woman”) is the easiest construal of the grammar and the context.
- 68 Perhaps Paul means to imply here that the relationship of δόξα that applies between God and man cannot be fully transposed to the man and woman, for woman and man exist in a relationship of interdependence that does not characterize God and man.
- 69 Noted by Ronald Cox, *By the Same Word: Creation and Salvation in Hellenistic Judaism and Early Christianity*, BZNW 145 (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2007), 149–50, among many others, including Lakey.
- 70 Noting that the phrase is parallel to “from God” in v. 12, Anders Hultgård, “God and Image of Woman in Early Jewish Religion,” in *Image of God and Gender Models in Judaeo-Christian Tradition*, ed. Kari Elisabeth Børresen (Oslo: Solum Forlag, 1991), 45, suggests that “the Lord” may here mean YHWH, not the Messiah.”

present, for, as v. 3 anticipates, they represent the order of creation (τὰ πάντα ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ, v. 12).⁷¹

We can now step back and consider again the statement that ἀνὴρ is εἰκὼν καὶ δόξα θεοῦ but that γυνή is δόξα ἀνδρός in v. 7. According to Paul's reading of Genesis, Adam is the image and glory of God *par excellence*, the bodily representative and vice-regent of God on earth, while Eve's secondary creation allows her to be defined by what she brings to and complements in Adam. Her creation ἐκ Adam puts her at a distance from the original image and glory—she is derivative. “Men” and “women” as bodily descended from Adam and Eve repristinate this relationship of differentiation (cf. Gen 5:3). But what does this mean for whether woman is also the image of God?

The Adam and Eve “aetiology of gender,” wherein woman is derivative but of the same substance as man,⁷² is at first blush easily assimilated to what Thomas Laqueur has termed the “one-sex model” of gender, which he describes as prevailing in antiquity; here male and female are differences not in kind but in degree, with maleness being closest to deity.⁷³ This “metaphysics of hierarchy” finds echoes in the present text, and could militate against drawing an absolute distinction between man and woman in terms of image of God.⁷⁴ But if Paul, as Lakey believes, thinks the male's God-likeness lies in a unique generative capacity over-against the woman's merely instrumental role in conception (highlighting the prepositions of v. 12),⁷⁵ then Paul has perhaps already taken a step toward the “physiology of incommensurability,” which Laqueur describes as becoming dominant in the eighteenth century. In this case, the answer to the question, is woman the image of God, would be “no.” And yet, Lakey's argument, while plausible, requires a surplus of meaning beyond or behind

71 It is possible to take this a step further: In the ἐκκλησία original creational intent is properly directed toward God (*in this sphere* τὰ πάντα ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ, v. 12), construing the relationship between man and woman as a microcosm of the divine agency of God and Christ (cf. the related prepositions in 1 Cor 8:6) and a sphere of God's cosmic redemptive work (cf. 1 Cor 12:4–6; 15:20–28). For this argument, cf. Lakey, *Image and Glory*, 77–96, 114–17, 122–34. The agreement in prepositions with 1 Cor 8:6 is also noted by Sean M. McDonough, *Christ as Creator: Origins of a New Testament Doctrine* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009), 170.

72 On “gender aetiologies,” cf. Jorunn Økland, *Women in Their Place: Paul and the Corinthian Discourse of Gender and Sanctuary Space*, JSNTSup 269 (London: T & T Clark, 2005), 39–57.

73 Thomas Walter Laqueur, *Making Sex: Body and Gender from the Greeks to Freud* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1990), 5–6, 62.

74 Økland, *Women in Their Place*, 47, refers to ways that gender can still be construed as “mutually exclusive” in this model.

75 Lakey, *Image and Glory*, 132.

the immediate claims and connections of Paul's argument—but so would the affirmation that woman is indeed the image of God. It seems that Paul is like Genesis, therefore, ambiguous concerning the issue. But we can be confident that he thought of the εἰκὼν θεοῦ, as it applies since and within creation, first and foremost in terms of the man.⁷⁶

Paul's positive affirmation of the created order in this text appears to contrast sharply with our reading of Galatians.⁷⁷ Whereas Paul can affirm that "in the Lord woman is not independent of man or man independent of woman" (1 Cor 11:11), in Galatians he said, "there is no longer male and female; for all of you are one in Christ Jesus" (3:28). The former is an affirmation of gender difference and interdependence as founded on creation; the latter, not clearly determined by its context, affirms the end of some construal of sex distinction which has its basis in the created order. However, the texts do have an important point of coherence: both are concerned explicitly or implicitly with the image of God, and in context both imbalance the relationship between male and female on grounds of God's created order. Whereas even a minimal construal of Gal 3:28 must entail a rectification of the gender imbalance founded in creation, Corinthians implicitly affirms the (relative) goodness and validity of the order of the present embodied constitutional hierarchy of the sexes arranged in creation. Thus 1 Cor 11:7–12 spells out the relationship of disadvantage between male and female that calls for its termination in Galatians. That relationship is entailed in the bodies of men and women, who are asymmetrically related to the image and glory of God. In this way, both texts make use of the image of God, and apply it to the present form of men and women.

We find then a tension not between creation as fallen and restored, but creation as a good and theologically pertinent reality (1 Cor 11:3, 7–12) and yet one which does not directly define and determine God's eschatological purposes for humankind (Gal 3:28). Our next text in 1 Corinthians doubly employs the εἰκὼν-concept in a manner that can be mapped on to this discussion. As we shall see, an eschatological frame of reference goes some way to addressing

76 This was hardly unique, as it was readily facilitated by reading Gen 1:26–27 in light of the events of Gen 2, and is even more strongly implied in Gen 5:1 and 3. Traditions that refer to the first human being crafted in the image of God by the name "Adam" can be read to make the same assumption of male privilege (4 Ezra 7:70; Sib. Or. 1:22–24); cf. Hultgård, "God and Image of Woman."

77 In 1 Cor 6:16 Paul quotes Gen 2:24 in order to interpret bodies in relation to the created order as well. Here, as in the present text of 1 Cor 11:7–12, somatic relationships established in creation continue to represent ontological conditions or possibilities even in the present.

Paul's apparently ambivalent attitude toward the continuing validity of norms that accord with the created order. It will also become apparent that, far from being anomalous, the *somatic* character of the image of God is well entrenched in Paul's thinking. However, the subject matter shifts from an explicit concern with humans as sexually bi-gendered to that of creatures facing the ambiguity of death.

The Images of Two Men: 1 Corinthians 15:45–50

Just as in the previous text, where Paul spoke of man as the image of God without any sense of the image being defaced, let alone lost, in the present text the *adamic* image (the change in terminology is to be noted) is borne by the descendants of the man of dust. The distinction Paul delineates in the present text between the images of the first and last man has been read as a transparent reference to the concept of the restoration of the image of God: how else shall Adam be opposed to Christ in terms of the image except as the one who spoils it with sin and death?⁷⁸ Two issues in fact confront us: how the images of the first and last Adam are to be related to the concept of image of God, if at all; and how the distinction between the two images is related to the sin of Adam. This text has the potential to add significantly to the picture of how Paul reads Gen 1–3, and if we can unlock its secrets, we will glimpse something of Paul's construal of God's intentions for humankind in the creation of the world.

A long tradition extending back to the early church interprets the resurrection body from the antithetic standpoint of the deleterious effects of Adam's fall on the flesh and blood bodies known to all humans.⁷⁹ Ronald Sider and

78 So Fee, *First Corinthians*, 778: "At stake is the biblical doctrine of creation. According to Scripture, God created the material order and pronounced it good. But in the Fall it also came under the curse. In Paul's view, therefore, the material order must also experience the effects of redemption in Christ, and that involves the physical body as well. Since in its present expression it is under the curse, it must be transformed; and that happens at the Eschaton, so that beginning and end meet in Christ Jesus."

79 Cf. the majority of patristic authors in Gerald L. Bray, ed., *1–2 Corinthians*, ACCS (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 2006), 165–74. An exception appears to be Theodore of Mopsuestia: "In the resurrection a better body is constructed, one which is no longer flesh and blood as such but which is an immortal and indestructible living being" in Pauline Commentary from the Greek Church (NTA 15:195); *ibid.*, 167. Contrast Augustine: "We will still be bodies, so vivified by the spirit, however, as to retain the substance of the flesh without suffering the accidents of sluggishness and mortality," *Civ. Dei*, 13.22; *ibid.*, 169. Similarly, Calvin, *1 Corinthians*, on 15:50, *ad loc.* Cf. Outi Lehtipuu, "Flesh and

N. T. Wright stand in some continuity with this tradition.⁸⁰ While neither views the resurrection body as a mere return to a pre-fall state, the primordial body remains in important respects the model for the eschatological body for each. In the early church, the sinfulness of the post-Edenic body had an important polemical function in battles with Gnosticism, and for Wright and Sider it serves to defend against interpretations of the resurrection body as “composed of glorious light rather than anything physical.”⁸¹

Dale Martin, Jeffrey Asher, and Troels Engberg-Pedersen⁸² may be taken as among the best representatives of the position that concerns Wright and Sider.⁸³ It is to be noted, however, that the *physicality* of the resurrection body *per se* is not called into question.⁸⁴ These scholars, rather, raise the critical issue of the function of Paul’s statements concerning the natural world which

Blood Cannot Inherit the Kingdom of God’: The Transformation of the Flesh in the Early Christian Debates Concerning Resurrection,” in *Metamorphoses: Resurrection, Body and Transformative Practices in Early Christianity*, ed. Turid Karlsen Seim and Jorunn Økland, Ekstasis 1 (New York: Walter de Gruyter, 2009), 147–68. Yet even within this trend of reading Paul’s words here in light of the sinful human body, patristic authors at a cursory glance still appear more comfortable with the language of heavenly glorification in a manner analogous to the shinning of the stars than we shall find Wright or Sider to be.

- 80 Although the problem of sin does not enter into the discussion of vv. 35–50, the matter of sin and its relation to death are not far to be found in the context. Paul cites, in 1 Cor 15:3–4, the early tradition “that Christ died for our sins”; insists in v. 17 that “if Christ has not been raised . . . you are still in your sins”; narrates in 21–22 that “death came through a human being” and, in a concluding flourish, proverbializes in 56 that “the sting of death is sin, and the power of sin is the law.” Below I offer a suggestion for how these themes are related to the two bodies of Adam and Christ.
- 81 N. T. Wright, *The Resurrection of the Son of God*, vol. 3 of *Christian Origins and the Question of God* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2003), 342.
- 82 Troels Engberg-Pedersen, *Cosmology and Self in the Apostle Paul: The Material Spirit* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010), 8–38; Jeffrey R. Asher, “Speiretai: Anthropogenic Metaphor in 1 Corinthians 15:42–44,” *JBL* 120 (2001): 101–22; idem, *Polarity and Change in 1 Corinthians 15: A Study of Metaphysics, Rhetoric, and Resurrection*, HUT 42 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2000); Martin, *The Corinthian Body*, 104–36.
- 83 One difference between Martin and Engberg-Pedersen should be noted: whereas Martin speaks of flesh, blood, and soul being *shed*, so that only immortal spirit remains, Engberg-Pedersen emphasizes the *transformation* of flesh and blood into *pneuma*; Martin, *The Corinthian Body*, 126; Engberg-Pedersen, *Cosmology and Self*, 32.
- 84 By working with this false alternative, Wright can devote much space to proving the physicality of the resurrection body as an argument against the view that this body is analogous to the heavenly bodies or that the *soma pneumatikion* is a body composed (in part?) of spirit; cf. Wright, *Resurrection*, 347–52, 357.

introduce the discussion of the resurrection body (vv. 36–41). The statements are interpreted as introducing a cosmological hierarchy (or “polarity”) within which the present and post-mortem body are directly identified. Since a common substance was often thought to characterize both the heavenly bodies and soul or *pneuma* (whether fire/ether or *pneuma* itself), these scholars suggest that Paul introduces these cosmological observations in order to define the ontology of the resurrection body within the upper end of the scale of nature.⁸⁵ However, no such identification of a common substance is explicitly made by Paul, so the claim can only be evaluated based on how well it explains details of the text and coheres with Paul’s thought generally. On this score, the proposal runs into problems. We should note how easily such an identification could have been made in order to resolve the Corinthians’ question, “with what kind of body do they [i.e., the dead] come?” (15:35).⁸⁶ Precisely because Paul anticipates that some of the Corinthians would be uncertain, one would expect him to make an explicit identification of common substance if that were the answer he had in mind. Rather, the common terms applied both to the heavenly bodies and the resurrection body (ἐπουράνιος, δόξα) need not denote an identity in substance, and other terms which characterize the resurrection body (especially, ἀφθαρσία) can only be applied to the heavenly bodies in an extenuated sense (cf. φθορά in Rom 8:21–22).⁸⁷

In order to insert some interpretive space between Paul’s reflection on the spatio-physical cosmos and his discussion of the resurrection body, both Wright and Sider paint the contrast between the present and future body in strong moral or ethical colours. Sider sees the moral/ethical issue in v. 42 and especially v. 43, where the natural body is characterized as being sown in ἀτιμία (“dishonour”) and ἀσθενεί (“weakness”), claiming, “The primary contrast

85 Cf. Engberg-Pedersen, *Cosmology and Self*, 19–22, 26–31 (esp. p. 28); Martin, *The Corinthian Body*, 117–20, 125–29.

86 Volker Rabens denies that the Corinthians’ questions (as formulated by Paul in v. 35) show “an interest in the very physics” of the resurrection body; *The Holy Spirit and Ethics in Paul: Transformation and Empowering for Religious-Ethical Life*, WUNT 283 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2010), 90. But Rabens cannot adequately account for Paul’s reflections on the natural world in vv. 36–41 and he seems interested here to guard his own negative claim that Paul does not conceive of the spirit materially or in the class of the heavenly bodies. Perplexity concerning the physics that would characterize a resurrection body, it should be noted, fits well within Greco-Roman assumptions; cf. Martin, *The Corinthian Body*, 108–23.

87 Rabens, *Holy Spirit and Ethics*, 90.

specified in v. 43 is therefore the ethical superiority of the resurrected person. He is no longer tainted by sin.”⁸⁸ The interpretation is capped by reading ἐφορέσωμεν (aor. sub.) in v. 49 (“Let us bear the image”),⁸⁹ with the conclusion that “the ‘spiritual body’ then is the total person freed from all connection with sin and filled with the gift of the spirit.”⁹⁰ While Wright does not adopt Sider’s arguments concerning vv. 42 and 43 he still leans on the contrast between “the body itself” and “sin and death which had taken up residence in it,” between the goodness of “being an embodied human” and the badness of “being [a] rebellious human, a decaying human, a human dishonoured through bodily sin and bodily death.”⁹¹ There are two devastating problems with this interpretation which make it a non-viable alternative to that of Martin, Asher, and Engberg-Pedersen: first it must reduce Paul’s reflections on nature to badly misleading “metaphors and similes,” the payoff of which are some rather general principles (resurrection as gift; varieties of bodies), and second, Paul in vv. 45–49 entirely undermines the heuristic value that any appeal to a contrast between the sin-infected body and the body itself could have when he goes straight to Gen 2:7 in order to contrast the present and the resurrection body.

Thus neither position seems to satisfactorily account for the details of Paul’s argument, one of them construing the relationship between the reflections on the natural world and the reflections on the resurrection body too strongly and the other too weakly. But if Paul’s reflections on nature are not introduced to define the resurrection body *per se* and if they are not simply illustrative of God’s creative activity, what function should be attributed to them? The key to a proper construal of the argument is in the typological nature of Paul’s thinking: *creation contains within itself signs of the eschaton*. Paul applies a typological hermeneutic to the created world that recalls the manner in which the Two Spirits Treatise reads an antecedent spiritual reality into the structures of creation reflected in Gen 1 and the manner in which the *Maskil* saw the order of the heavens and alteration between dark and light as reflecting the experience of the community.⁹² The details differ but the underlying conviction is the same: the creation artfully reflects the divine plan unfolding in history. One rarely encounters the application of the typological argument to anything but

88 Ronald J. Sider, “Pauline Conception of the Resurrection Body in 1 Corinthians 15:35–54,” *NTS* 21 (1975): 433.

89 *Ibid.*, 434.

90 *Ibid.*, 435.

91 Wright, *Resurrection*, 343; cf., too, p. 356 where the implication is made of the restoration of the image described in Gen 1:26–27, also suggesting the framework of the fall.

92 Cf. “Creation and the Divine Plan” in Chapter 2.

Paul's correlation of the two Adams in vv. 45–49, although a broader application was made some time ago by Geerhardus Vos, who simultaneously deals with the weakness of the moralizing argument we critiqued above:

The apostle was intent upon showing that in the plan of God from the outset provision was made for a higher kind of body . . . The abnormal (body of sin) and the eschatological are not so logically correlated that the one can be postulated from the other. But the world of creation and the world to come *are* thus correlated, the one pointing forward to the other.⁹³

In particular, the *duality of heaven and earth* (vv. 39–41) anticipates the transformation of believers into the eschatological/resurrection state, according to the same workings whereby God transforms a seed into a plant (vv. 36–38). Paul finds these things in part in Gen 1–3. The typological reading of nature will provide the clue to a proper interpretation of the relationship between the two Adams and the image of God.

The exposition of the nature of the resurrection body begins in v. 42 with the words οὕτως καὶ ἡ ἀνάστασις τῶν νεκρῶν. Immediately, then, Paul indicates the close relationship (“so also”) between his reflections on the world of nature (vv. 36–41) and his statements concerning the nature of the resurrection body. But it is not apparent yet what that relationship will be. The next sentence begins with the word σπείρεται (“it is sown”), which links back to the first reflection on nature, in vv. 36–38, where Paul impatiently reminds his interlocutor that death precedes the coming to life of what is sown (ὁ σπείρεις, v. 36), that what is sown is *not* (οὐ) the body that shall be (v. 37), and that God gives to each seed a predetermined body (v. 38). Implicitly, v. 36 establishes continuity in event between what happens to seeds and human bodies, v. 37 the discontinuity between the before and after of the seed-body, and v. 38 God’s oversight and activity in the whole process. Whether the questions are construed as two or really one, Paul’s answer to the objection “How are the dead raised? With what kind of body do they come?” (v. 35) treats both the “how” and the “what,” but as the discussion unfolds it is the assertion of discontinuity between seed and plant (i.e., the “what” of the resurrection body) that carries the brunt of the argument. We expect, therefore, that when Paul begins to speak of the resurrection of the dead with the words “it is sown . . . it is raised . . .” in v. 42

93 Geerhardus Vos, *The Pauline Eschatology*, 2nd ed. (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1961), 169 n. 19. I owe the reference to Lincoln, *Paradise Now and Not Yet*, 43.

we will learn something of the contrasting *ontology* of the body before and after resurrection, in creation and recreation.

Paul prepares for this subject in the second group of reflections on the natural world, in vv. 39–41, where Paul stops speaking of seeds and their new bodies, and takes up the difference between σώματα ἐπουράνια and σώματα ἐπίγεια, “heavenly bodies” and “earthly bodies” (v. 40). Though each has its own “glory” (δόξα, v. 40), Paul characterizes the latter as having different kinds of “flesh” (σάρξ, v. 39) and the former as possessing different degrees of “radiance” (δόξα, v. 41). So when Paul wants to contrast different kinds of bodies, he turns to the duality between heaven and earth, even though either sphere in itself could have offered such a contrast.⁹⁴ Therefore, when Paul turns to elucidate the difference between bodies pre- and post-resurrection we expect the contrast to be informed by the difference between earthly-fleshly bodies and heavenly-radiant bodies.

How these two sets of expectations are fulfilled in what follows is the key question. One expects to learn of contrasting ontologies and for the difference in heavenly and earthly bodies to have some role in the illumination of that contrast. The difference in heavenly and earthly bodies does not simply establish the point that there is more than one kind of possible body. Paul begins his explanation with a statement of four contrasts answering to σπείρεται and ἐγείρεται, “it is sown” and “it is raised”: ἐν φθορᾷ/ἐν ἀφθαρσίᾳ, ἐν ἀτιμίᾳ/ἐν δόξῃ, ἐν ἀσθενείᾳ/ἐν δυνάμει, σῶμα ψυχικόν/σῶμα πνευματικόν (vv. 42–44). The body is sown in corruption, dishonour, weakness, and as a *psychic* body, but it is raised in incorruption, glory, power, and as a *pneumatic* body. According to one stream of interpretation our first expectation—to learn of contrasting ontologies—is let down: Paul’s contrasts are said to concern *mode* not *substance*, both the ἐν preposition and the -ιχος adjectives pointing in this direction.⁹⁵ But that Paul has no such distinction in mind is particularly clear in relation to the dominant terms φθορά/ἀφθαρσία, “perishable”/“imperishable” (vv. 42, 50, 52, 53, 54), the former of which anticipates the adjective χοϊκος (“earthly”)

94 C. K. Barrett, *A Commentary on the First Epistle to the Corinthians*, 2nd ed., BNTC (New York: Harper & Row, 1992), 371, regards the change to “flesh” (from body) in v. 39 as “unfortunate” given its “theological connotation” elsewhere in Paul, whereas this is pure “physiology” and “enters theology only as analogy.” Rather, Paul’s shift to “flesh” here facilitates his argument later that the transformation the body undergoes in resurrection involves a type of reconstitution into a heavenly existence. The example of the seed-plant demonstrated transformation, but did not in itself provide adequate categories within which to comprehend the contrasting conditions of the natural and resurrection body.

95 Thiselton, *First Corinthians*, 1276–77.

in vv. 47–49, which can hardly exclude a reference to substance, despite its suffix.⁹⁶ We need not yet attempt to dissect the contrast between σῶμα ψυχικόν and σῶμα πνευματικόν, except to question the efficacy of arguments designed to rule out a difference in substance between the two bodies. The adjectival ending is, again, not decisive, and some weight should be given to the fact that πνευματικός is nowhere extant.⁹⁷ Furthermore, if ψυχή and πνεῦμα are themselves conceived as substantial/material (and there is debate), then a body *animated* by such is a body partly *composed* of such.⁹⁸ Finally, and this is the important point, even a body animated by (rather than composed of) spirit will be a body of transformed substance. Verse 50, unless it contains an unfortunate choice of words rather than a deliberately chosen phrase, bears this out: “*flesh and blood* cannot inherit the kingdom of God.”⁹⁹ This statement should not be separated from the previous discussion concerning the nature of the resurrection body and made to refer generically and moralistically to “the natural man as a frail creature in opposition to God.”¹⁰⁰ There is no choice to be made between mode and substance therefore. In part, this multivalence

96 BDAG: “made of earth/dust.” For the distinction between adjectives formed with -ινο versus -ινο suffixes, cf. Herbert Weir Smyth, *A Greek Grammar* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1956), 237–38.

97 According to Archibald Robertson and Alfred Plummer, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the First Epistle of St. Paul to the Corinthians*, 2nd ed., ICC (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1914), 372, “the adjectives mean ‘congenital with,’ ‘formed to the organ of.’” Robertson and Plummer themselves did not understand this to rule out a change in substance, however.

98 They would need not be seen as solely composed thereof, which would be impossible of the first; cf. v. 45. Cf., e.g., Litwa, *Transformed*, 130–31.

99 “For the Kingdom an incorruptible body wholly controlled by spirit is necessary, and this ‘flesh and blood’ cannot be”: Robertson and Plummer, *First Corinthians*, 375.

100 Pace Joachim Jeremias, “‘Flesh and Blood Cannot Inherit the Kingdom of God’ (1 Corinthians 15:50),” *NTS* 2 (1956): 152. Jeremias’ argument rests on his understanding of how the whole passage is structured in relation to the questions of v. 35, with vv. 36–49 answering the what of the resurrection body and vv. 50–57, the how of the events. Instead, it seems that both questions are addressed in the initial section (for the how, cf., esp., v. 38), and that v. 50 simultaneously sums up the section that began with v. 35 and anticipates the new direction begun in v. 51; cf. James D. G. Dunn, “How Are the Dead Raised? With What Body Do They Come? Reflections on 1 Corinthians 15,” *SwJT* 45 (2002): 12–13. We have in this phrase, as in Paul’s reflections on the natural world (vv. 36–41), more misleading words on the apostle’s part if “flesh and blood,” like the prior reflection, is not supposed to bear on the nature of the resurrection body *per se*.

emerges from Paul's sowing metaphor, which appears to speak almost simultaneously at times of the body as it is, as created, and as buried.¹⁰¹

How is the second expectation met, that the contrast between the body before and after resurrection will be informed by the distinction between earthly and heavenly bodies? From Paul's initial series of contrasts between the body before and after resurrection (vv. 42–44), the only lexical agreements with his discussion of heavenly and earthly bodies (vv. 39–41) concern the use of σῶμα and δόξα. Paul distinguished between σώματα ἐπίγεια and ἐπουράνια and now of the resurrection distinguishes between σῶμα ψυχικόν and σῶμα πνευματικόν; the change in terms complicates a direct identification between the two sets of bodies, especially, of course, of the latter pairs.¹⁰² Δόξα characterized the heavenly bodies in particular, where it denoted radiance,¹⁰³ and it is used in vv. 42–43 of the resurrection body opposite ἀτιμία and parallel to ἀφθαρσία and δύναμις.¹⁰⁴ Opposite ἀτιμία, δόξα need not denote radiance, but parallel to the other terms that connotation is not far from mind (cf. Ps 62:3 [E: 63:2]; Wis 7:25; Matt 24:30; also Rev 18:1; 4 Ezra 16:12), as indeed it seems present in the

101 For the three positions, cf. Joseph A. Fitzmyer, *First Corinthians: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*, AB (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2008), 595, who denies that a choice can be made; Asher wants to deny the third sense (burial), but that seems forced in view of v. 36; still his argument that the sowing metaphor is anthropogonic is of value and finds confirmation in various parts of the text, not least vv. 44–45; cf. Asher, "Speiretai"; Asher, *Polarity and Change*.

102 Unless we can assume that Paul had in mind the Stoic assumption that the stars are composed of πνεῦμα, which cannot be verified (if he had, why did he not make full use of the point rhetorically?). Alternatively, Paul may have in mind the concept of angels as spirit beings (Heb 1:14) who dwell in heaven (12:22–23; Gal 1:8–9) and can be (somehow) identified with the stars (Job 38:7; Dan 8:10; Rev 12:4). Again, however, the connection would only be implicit; Paul does not speak of angelic spirits, only of the sun, moon, and stars.

103 Wright is certain that the δόξα (1 Cor 14:40) of the earthly bodies has no connotation of radiance, splendour; *Resurrection*, 345–46. I am less certain; cf. Ps 8:6 (E: 5); 21:6 (E: 5).

104 The strongest proof for the view that Paul has in mind the body under the domination of sin is in his use of the term ἀτιμία, but it must be interpreted relative to the contrast with the resurrected body as δόξα. The parallel in Phil 3:21 is instructive, although there the term is ταπεινώσις, but most decisive are Rom 9:21 ("Has the potter no right over the clay, to make out of the same lump one object for special [τιμὴν] use and another for ordinary [ἀτιμίαν] use?") and the same two terms in 1 Tim 2:20 ("In a large house there are utensils not only of gold and silver but also of wood and clay, some for special use, some for ordinary"). In this light, ἀτιμία does not refer to sinful corruption and shamefulfulness, but to the lowly, ordinary earthly body in comparison with the exalted, glorious heavenly body.

closely parallel Phil 3:21.¹⁰⁵ The alignment of these contrasts, the earthly with the pre- and the heavenly with the post-resurrection body, becomes explicit only in vv. 47–49, but it does indeed become explicit, and immediately thereafter Paul sets “flesh and blood” alongside that which is φθορά as not being able to inherit the kingdom of God (v. 50). Thus, in Paul’s initial four-fold contrast between the pre- and post-resurrection body the difference between its being φθορά in the first state but δόξα in the next is already informed by the initial contrast between the earthly bodies as kinds of “flesh” and the heavenly bodies as degrees of “glory.”¹⁰⁶ However, it is sometimes remarked that οὐρανός and cognates undergo a shift in meaning from v. 40 to vv. 47–49, but the change from “starry skies” to “abode of God” (if that is what the latter means) should be seen as different points on a continuum (cf. 2 Cor 12:2–4). When Paul thus speaks of Adam as ἐκ γῆς but of the second man as ἐξ οὐρανοῦ (v. 47), we are surely invited to reflect back on the natural world duality between heaven and earth (vv. 39–41). That duality points to the glorious, immortal, and heavenly condition of the resurrection, as opposed to the corruptible dust and flesh of existence on earth.¹⁰⁷ Paul points to the starry skies not because they consist of immortal substance and are themselves incorruptible, but because they anticipate the future life of believers (cf. Dan 12:2–3; 1 En. 104:2, 6; Wis 3:7; 4 Macc 17:5; Matt 13:43; Col 1:5, 12).¹⁰⁸ Perhaps they do so by directing one’s gaze (up) to heaven—where there is a heavenly Jerusalem (Gal 4:26) and paradise (2 Cor 12:2–4) in addition to the last Adam. But probably there is a different reason the starry skies anticipate the future life of believers. In Paul’s initial fourfold contrast, it appears that the earthly stands on the side of the corruptible, dishonourable, weak, and σῶμα ψυχικόν (for the latter term, cf. vv. 40 and 47) and

105 Wright, *Resurrection*, 345 and n. 100, does not want to admit the notion of radiance in these references (nor in 1 Cor 2:7–8), but that is most improbable. Cf. BDAG δόξα and, especially, Carey C. Newman, *Paul’s Glory-Christology: Tradition and Rhetoric*, NovTSup 69 (Leiden: Brill, 1992), 17–24, 83–92, 92–104, 134–53, 157–63, 188–96. Newman (pp. 193–96), furthermore, plausibly argues for a connection between the glorious body in 1 Cor 15:35–50 and the appearance of Christ to Paul in glory on the road to Damascus (1 Cor 9:1–2; 15:1–12).

106 Similarly, earlier in the letter where Paul had contrasted the ψυχικός with the πνευματικός ἄνθρωπος (2:13–14), the former were further belittled as σαρκινός (3:1). On the textual variant, σαρκινός, cf. Fitzmyer, *First Corinthians*, 186.

107 Cf. Garland, who in connection to vv. 39–41 speaks of a “hierarchy of opposites: ‘earthly/below/lesser’ and ‘heavenly/above/greater’”; Garland, *1 Corinthians*, 731.

108 “This physical demarcation [the duality of heaven and earth] pointed toward a spiritual distinction: earth as the dwelling place of humankind, the heavens as the place where God dwells”; Maile, “Heaven, Heavens, Paradise,” in *DPL*, 381 (381–83).

that the heavenly, by a matter of degree, proximity, or loose association, stands on the side of the incorruptible, glorious, powerful, and σῶμα πνευματικόν (cf. v. 47).¹⁰⁹ Inasmuch as the dominant contrast throughout the text is that of corruptibility vs. incorruptibility, it appears that the *durability* of the heavens is the most significant way in which they anticipate the resurrection body, followed closely by their radiance (cf. Deut 11:17; Ps 89:3, 29 [E: 2, 28]; Job 14:12; Sir 45:15; 2 Cor 5:1–4 with 12:2–4).

Thus, the natural world reflections with which Paul introduces the resurrection of the body establish God's power to transform the σῶμα ψυχικόν into the σῶμα πνευματικόν (vv. 36–38), and introduce the categories by which that transformation is best grasped in terms of observable realities (vv. 39–41). In creation Paul sees God's power at work and God's intentions reflected.¹¹⁰ The duality of heaven and earth in particular stands in a typological relationship to the eschatological destiny of believers as those who will experience the transformation into “heavenly” persons with “heavenly” bodies. The term “heavenly body” is one that Paul does not use, though he comes close (vv. 47–49). “Heavenly” in this construction is not merely natural (i.e., astral), but eschatological/cosmic: the resurrection provides bodies which are fitted for the world-to-come, in which the cleft between heaven and the observable cosmos is finally overcome (cf. 1 Cor 15:24–28).¹¹¹ The typological sense of Paul's reflections is further enhanced by noting that scriptural allusions have silently informed the argument heretofore.¹¹²

109 Cf. Fitzmyer: “Moreover, the eschatological aspect is introduced in vv. 44b–49, because *sōma psychikon* and *sōma pneumatikon* contrast not only times (*protos* and *eschatos*), but also the terrestrial and the celestial”; Fitzmyer, *First Corinthians*, 592; cf. Garland, *1 Corinthians*, 725.

110 John Paul Heil, *The Rhetorical Role of Scripture in 1 Corinthians*, Studies in Biblical Literature (Leiden: Brill, 2005), 237–38: “With the two related but distinct examples of God's creative power in 15:36–41, each of which alludes to the scriptural account of creation, Paul is leading his audience to the realization that, since God gives to something that is sown and dies a body as God wishes (first example in 15:36–38), the God who created both earthly and heavenly bodies that differ in glory (second example in 15:39–41) can transform an earthly body that has died into a heavenly body.”

111 On the firming of the barrier between heaven and earth in post-exilic Judaism, cf. Christopher Rowland, *The Open Heaven: A Study of Apocalyptic in Judaism and Early Christianity* (London: SPCK, 1982), 78–84, and on Paul, especially, 374–86.

112 Paul's scriptural context is God's creative activity in Gen 1, particularly the duality of heaven and earth. Already, Paul's talk of sowing (σπείρω), seeds (σπέρμα), and the bodies God gives to seeds (ἰδὼν σῶμα) in vv. 36–38 recalls Gen 1:11 (καὶ εἶπεν ὁ θεός βλαστήσάτω ἡ γῆ βοτάνην χόρτου σπείρον σπέρμα κατὰ γένος καὶ καθ' ὁμοιότητα, and v. 12). The varieties of flesh, in addition to those of ἀνθρώπων, namely κτηνῶν, πτηνῶν, and ἰχθύων (1 Cor 15:39),

When Paul finally takes up his explicit scriptural argument (vv. 45–49), he wants to elaborate on the claim, Εἰ ἔστιν σῶμα ψυχικόν, ἔστιν καὶ πνευματικόν, “If there is a *psychic* body, there is also a *pneumatic* (body)” (15:44). Paul’s scriptural argument will show that the language of “sowing” and “raising” in vv. 42–44 *each* served in part to qualify the body as an aspect of the creative activity of God;¹¹³ he does not have in mind its subsequent defilement by sin. He writes, “Thus it is written, ‘The first man, Adam, became a living being’ (ψυχὴν ζῶσαν); the last Adam became a life-giving spirit (πνεῦμα ζωοποιοῦν). But it is not the spiritual that is first, but the natural (ψυχικόν), and then the spiritual” (vv. 45–46). Much has been made to stand behind the explicit denial οὐ πρῶτον τὸ πνευματικόν (“it is not the spiritual that is first”), but in context of the argument it serves to underscore the basic point that ‘this’ body is not the body that shall be, and in that sense it implicitly justifies Paul’s extrapolation of the ἔσχατος Adam from the πρῶτος Adam of Gen 2:7 (v. 45). In fact, the denial’s place in the argument is the same as that at v. 37 concerning the planted seed: οὐ τὸ σῶμα τὸ γενησόμενον σπείρεις.¹¹⁴ The earthly body of the first Adam is *not the body that shall be*. Because Paul knows nothing of Adam’s lost glory or supernatural condition he can add the rhetorically pertinent point, “it is not the spiritual that is first.” Instead, Paul cites and lightly modifies Gen 2:7c to elucidate the differ-

are drawn in reverse order from the pronouncement of humankind’s vocation to “rule” (ἄρχετωσαν) such creatures in Gen 1:26, 28 (moving backwards from days six to four, vv. 20–25). The heavenly bodies—sun, moon, and stars (1 Cor 15:41)—recall the “lights” of day four, “greater” and “lesser,” and the “stars,” and their “rule” (ἄρχάς, ἄρχειν) over day and night (vv. 14–18). The basic duality of heaven and earth, of course, introduces and concludes the whole account of God’s creative activity (Gen 1:1; 2:1, 4), wherein each realm is outfitted with its distinct inhabitants (παῖς ὁ κόσμος αὐτῶν/מַלְאכֵי הָעוֹלָם, Gen 2:1), just as Paul emphasizes varieties in each respective realm. It has also been suggested that the description of the sown seed as γυμνὸν κόκκον (1 Cor 15:37) reflects the nakedness of Adam and Eve (Gen 2:25, etc.). This is possible in view of vv. 45–49, but the use of the term here may simply reflect Paul’s overarching concern, the human body.

113 Hence, the passives there may be regarded as “divine”; cf. Asher, “Speiretai,” 109.

114 The similarity between v. 37 (and 38) and v. 46 is too little noted, but it shows how integral and natural the latter claim is to the argument. The sense of its being out-of-place has led many to postulate that Paul polemicizes against Gnostic or Philonic tendencies among the Corinthians; cf., e.g., Martinus C. de Boer, *The Defeat of Death: Apocalyptic Eschatology in 1 Corinthians 15 and Romans 5*, JSNTSup 22 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1988), 95; and the rebuttal in Stephen J. Hultgren, “The Origin of Paul’s Doctrine of the Two Adams in 1 Corinthians 15.45–49,” *JSNT* 25 (2003): 343–70, although his own thesis is highly speculative. Instead, it is possible to see Paul adopting and adapting exegetical tendencies which were “in the air” in relation to Gen 1–2 in order to assist his primary polemical point: the body will be resurrected, but not as this earthly (*adamic*) body.

ence between the first and the last: the first man Adam became a ψυχὴν ζῶσαν. The last Adam, on the other hand, Paul continues, became a πνεῦμα ζωοποιούν.¹¹⁵ The difference between “living *psyche*” and “life-giving *pneuma*” speaks to the superiority of the last Adam, but also likely reflects the different manner in which each stands at the head of humanity, the first as biological head, the second by supernaturally imparting the πνεῦμα which he himself became (cf. Rom 8:9–11).¹¹⁶

The key to grasping what the terms σῶμα ψυχικόν and σῶμα πνευματικόν convey may lie in Paul’s citation of Gen 2:7c, which clearly intends (οὕτως) to explain the terms, or at least the former. It is clear that Paul means to tie σῶμα ψυχικόν to the first Adam, who became ψυχὴν ζῶσαν, according to Gen 2:7. Typically the phrase “living being/*psyche*” is understood to lend to the term “*psychic* body” (σῶμα ψυχικόν) the sense that Adam’s body is animated or perhaps composed by soul. But the scriptural context suggests otherwise. Paul cites the third of as many clauses (the parentheses show the text as Paul cites it):

καὶ ἔπλασεν ὁ θεὸς τὸν ἄνθρωπον χοῦν ἀπὸ τῆς γῆς
καὶ ἐνεφύσησεν εἰς τὸ πρόσωπον αὐτοῦ πνοὴν ζωῆς
(καὶ) ἐγένετο ὁ (πρῶτος) ἄνθρωπος (Ἀδὰμ) εἰς ψυχὴν ζῶσαν

The first clause recounts the material construction of the human being, and corresponds to the outward bodily aspect. The second describes the animation of that body with “breath of life.” The third, which Paul cites, appears to

115 Although the phrase is possibly informed by Gen 2:7b, it is not presented as an exegesis of that text; Paul does not find the last Adam in the words ἐνεφύσησεν εἰς τὸ πρόσωπον αὐτοῦ πνοὴν ζωῆς. For this argument, cf. Gregory E. Sterling, “‘Wisdom among the Perfect’: Creation Traditions in Alexandrian Judaism and Corinthian Christianity,” *NovT* 37 (1995): 358–59; also Menahem Kister, “‘First Adam’ and ‘Second Adam’ in 1 Cor 15:45–49 in the Light of Midrashic Exegesis and Hebrew Usage,” in *New Testament and Rabbinic Literature*, ed. Reimund Bieringer et al., *JSJSup* 136 (Leiden: Brill, 2010), 353–54. If the phrase recalls Gen 2:7b, perhaps it is not merely in reflecting the tradition that substitutes πνεῦμα for πνοή (Gen 6:17; 7:15) but in the manner that the last Adam comes to stand in a position analogous to God who created Adam, for the last Adam is not merely a “living spirit” (analogous to “living soul”) but a “life-giving spirit”; similarly, cf. Romano Penna, “Adamic Christology and Anthropological Optimism in 1 Corinthians 15:45–49,” in *Paul the Apostle: A Theological and Exegetical Study*, 2 vols. (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1996), 209, 220.

116 Benjamin Gladd stresses that Gen 5:3 is already in mind here in v. 45 in addition to v. 49, thus reinforcing the typological nature of Paul’s hermeneutical method; cf. “The Last Adam as the ‘Life-Giving Spirit’ Revisited: A Possible Old Testament Background of One of Paul’s Most Perplexing Phrases,” *WTJ* 71 (2009): 297–309.

describe the combined result of each of the preceding actions: Adam (so Paul) became a “living being/*psyche*.” The term does more than simply repeat the animating principle of the second line, but rather refers to the totality of Adam as an earthling in whom is the breath of life. The Hebrew behind the text will confirm that *ψυχή* corresponds closely to the material component designated in clause A. The *adam* in Hebrew becomes *הָאָדָם הַחַי*. The phrase appears to reflect the antonymous use of *הָאָדָם הַמֵּת* for the dead person or a corpse in such texts as Lev 21:11 (*מֵת הָאָדָם הַחַי* / *ψυχή* τετελευτηκυία), Num 6:6 (*מֵת הָאָדָם הַחַי* / *ψυχή* τετελευτηκυία), and Lev 19:28; 21:1; 22:4, etc. (simply, *הָאָדָם הַחַי* / *ψυχή*).¹¹⁷ The word *ψυχή*, then, in 1 Cor 15:45 does not designate a “soul” as separate from or animating the body but rather defines a kind of (living) body itself, namely an earthly, natural, even “animal body”;¹¹⁸ it designates the whole corporeal being from the standpoint of its participation in earthly, created life. In the language of Gen 1–2 (for the exact term: Gen 1:20, 24; 2:19; cf., too, 1:21, 30), *ψυχήν ζῶσαν* places the first human on the level of the very animals Paul had enumerated as kinds of flesh in v. 39. Likewise, then, *σῶμα ψυχικόν* will not describe a body animated or composed of *ψυχή* but rather the body that is earthly, fleshly, and subject to decay (whether animated or not). Their contextual antonyms in Paul’s argument, *πνεῦμα ζωοποιούν* and *σῶμα πνευματικόν*, will likewise employ *πνεῦμα* not primarily to designate an animating principle or substance (although these are not contradicted),¹¹⁹ but rather to designate an orientation to that which is incorruptible, heavenly, a participation, that is, in the very nature of God.¹²⁰ Remarkably, Paul appears to share the thoroughly naturalistic interpretation of Gen 2:7 we saw in the Hodayot. Thus John R. Levison even suggests that “the seeds of Paul’s contrast of the two Adams may lie in the arid soil of Qumran.”¹²¹

The last section of the text (vv. 47–49) returns to the contrast between the earthly/corruptible and the heavenly/incorruptible, making explicit the significance of the two Adams (who are now simply men, *ἄνθρωποι*, v. 47) for those

117 Cf. HALOT 9 *הָאָדָם הַחַי*; T. Muraoka, *A Greek-English Lexicon of the Septuagint* (Louvain: Peeters, 2009), *ψυχή* 4–5 (noting that this use of the term first appears in the LXX).

118 For the latter term: Robertson and Plummer, *First Corinthians*, 372.

119 Contra, Wright, *Resurrection*, 354 (347–56).

120 Cf. Paul’s words in 2 Cor 5:1–5: “For we know that if the earthly tent we live in is destroyed, we have a building from God, a house not made with hands, eternal in the heavens. . . . He who has prepared us for this very thing is God, who has given us the Spirit as a guarantee” (vv. 1 & 5). The key point is that both texts describe the future life of the believer as a participation in a heavenly, eternal reality, and one which the spirit secures. We may skirt the issue of whether the text speaks of resurrection or an intermediate state, or perhaps neither.

121 Levison, *Filled*, 313.

who are connected to them (esp. v. 48). The breakdown in parallelism in v. 47 is significant:

ὁ πρῶτος ἄνθρωπος	ἐκ γῆς	χοϊκός,
ὁ δεύτερος ἄνθρωπος	ἐξ οὐρανοῦ.	

The earthly/heavenly contrast of vv. 39–41 returns, but significantly, while Paul defines the first man as not only “from earth” but “earthly,” he only describes the second man as “from heaven.” The presence of *χοϊκός* confirms that Paul understands there to be a *substantial* difference between the two men, while the absence of a corresponding term in the parallel construction confirms our suggestion that the eschatological body cannot be comprehended entirely within the scale of nature. Instead, the duality of “earthly” and “heavenly” includes a symbolic, typological significance by which it reflects the contrast between the *present* earthly realm, which is known, and the *eschatological* heavenly realm, which is not fully known (1 Cor 13:12).

Finally, to reflect on Paul’s use of *εἰκών*-language in v. 49: *καὶ καθὼς ἐφορέσαμεν τὴν εἰκόνα τοῦ χοϊκοῦ, φορέσομεν*¹²² *καὶ τὴν εἰκόνα τοῦ ἐπουρανίου*. 1 Corinthians 11:7 indeed did not lead us astray, for the “bearing” (*φορέω*) of the image here is without doubt *somatic*.¹²³ the image of the man of dust corresponds to the *σῶμα ψυχικόν* and the image of the man of heaven to the *σῶμα πνευματικόν*. In the former case, the image is borne through the natural processes of descent, which has rightly led many scholars to highlight Gen 5:3 as being similar in thought.¹²⁴ That text stands at the head of a litany of obituaries (note the

122 *Φορέσωμεν*, the aorist subjunctive, is both much better attested and more difficult, the two of which combined would normally point in its favour. However, the fact that the short *o* of the future was likely heard the same as the long *ō* of the subjunctive puts the weight back on the exegetical argument, and here the future indicative is far to be preferred. Cf. Barrett, *First Corinthians*, 369 n. 2; Thiselton, *First Corinthians*, 1288–89; Bruce Manning Metzger, *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament*, 2nd ed. (Stuttgart: Deutsche Biblegesellschaft, 1994), 502. Yet see Raymond F. Collins, *First Corinthians*, SP (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1999), 572; Fee, *First Corinthians*, 794–95.

123 Human beings bear the image of Adam inasmuch as they bodily descend from Adam, “the first man” (v. 45, 47). The verb, which regularly refers to the wearing of clothes or adornments, is used metaphorically for wearing the same bodily constitution; the concept is further reflected in vv. 53–54 where the verb *ἐνδύω* (“to put on, clothe”) is used to speak of the transformation of the body from being mortal and corruptible to their opposite.

124 “[Adam] became the father of a son in his likeness [יִמְצָאֵהוּ; κατὰ τὴν ἰδέαν αὐτοῦ], according to his image [יִמְצָאֵהוּ; κατὰ τὴν εἰκόνα αὐτοῦ], and named him Seth.”

unusual “and he died,” vv. 5, 8, 11, 14, 17, 20, 27, 31),¹²⁵ which corresponds to the condition which is overcome in the bearing of the image of the man of heaven in the present text. And, yet, the mention of “image” in so close connection with “Adam” can scarcely fail to call to mind Gen 1:26–27,¹²⁶ which is also referenced immediately prior to Gen 5:3 in vv. 1–2, and which, of course, appeared in 1 Cor 11:7–12, where it was conflated with Gen 2–3 and inseparably related to biological realities, implicitly including death.¹²⁷ However, to presuppose that there is a *restoration* of the image of God in the heavenly man would put the text on a collision course with everything said thus far, which has focused on the continuity of the present body with the original created condition of Adam, and would reduce to ashes the argument Paul made in 1 Cor 11:7–12 where, again, no interruption in the bearing of the image from Adam to his descendants was envisaged.

Rather, the conceptuality that best explains the pairing of the two images is in fact the duality of heaven and earth. The application of such a duality to the term εἰκών derives warrant directly from Gen 1:26–27 itself.¹²⁸ The image of the man of dust and the image of the man of heaven reflect the creation of

125 It is perhaps not without significance that the exception to those who receive the notice of death in this lineage is Enoch, whom the LXX relates to have been “translated” (μετέθηκεν) by God (Gen 5:24). Of course, Enoch’s experience becomes paradigmatic of the heavenly life for a whole stream of Jewish thought.

126 Some dispute this. For recent examples: Worthington, *Creation in Paul and Philo*, 192–95; Lorenzen, *Eikon-Konzept*, 161. Fee thinks εἰκών here is “probably not fraught with theological overtones”; *First Corinthians*, 794 n. 34. If Paul links male and female in a bodily relation to Adam as image and glory of God in a context combining Gen 1:26–27 with Gen 2:7ff. as in 1 Cor 11:7, how can it seem unlikely that Gen 1:26–27 has some resonance here as well? In an effort to deny this, Worthington, *Creation in Paul and Philo*, 194, stresses that “Paul has in mind Adam’s bodily construction.” But that is precisely the point.

127 Thus, *contra*, C. Kavin Rowe: “εἰκών has to do not with some primordial god-like image within, but with the character, stamp or shape of bodily life”; “New Testament Iconography? Situating Paul in the Absence of Material Evidence,” in *Picturing the New Testament: Studies in Ancient Visual Images*, ed. Annette Weissenrieder, Friederike Wendt, and Petra von Gemünden, WUNT 193 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2005), 302. Rather, εἰκών has to do with some primordial god-like image borne in the *somatic*-existence itself of either the man of dust or the man of heaven.

128 This argument is further supported if Ciampa and Rosner are correct to write concerning v. 40: “Paul’s usage of the word for ‘glory’ in this verse and the next and the distinction he makes here between the glory of the earthly bodies and the glory of heavenly ones prepares the way for his introduction of the concept of the ‘image’ of the earthly man and the heavenly man in v. 49. In 11:7 Paul tied together the concepts of ‘image’ and ‘glory,’ as he also does in Romans 1:23 and in 2 Corinthians 3:18; 4:4. In the case of human

humankind κατὰ the image and likeness of God: Paul presupposes that man as image of God reflects a corresponding transcendent image of God, an interpretation which LXX Genesis appears to make explicit and which is arguably present in the original.¹²⁹ The heavenly image (v. 47) is borne by the *second* man: Paul himself is not focused on the question of the pre-existence or incarnation of Christ, but on the transformation to the heavenly reality which is achieved through the bodily resurrection of Christ, the head of a new humanity.¹³⁰ Paul leaves undertermined the question whether the heavenly, divine counterpart in which Adam was created also had a pre-existence or was purely an eschatological/typological reality. (Genesis itself highly suggests pre-existence.) Implied in the argument, therefore, is the identification of Christ, the heavenly image, as that image of God referred to by Gen 1:26–27 in which the man of dust was made.¹³¹ The emphasis on the heavenly “man,” therefore, should neither be taken to imply a restoration of Adam’s original image nor should its oxymoronic character be avoided, for what happens in the heavenly man stretches the category “human” to its limit.¹³²

beings, at least, a body’s glory is directly related to the image it bears”; *The First Letter to the Corinthians*, PNTC (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2010), 807.

- 129 Cf., e.g., Trygve N. D. Mettinger, “Abbild oder Urbild: ‘Imago Dei’ in traditionsgeschichtlicher Sicht,” *ZAW* 86 (1974): 403–24.
- 130 Rightly emphasized by Matthew Black, “The Pauline Doctrine of the Second Adam,” *SJT* 7 (1954): 171–72.
- 131 On the pre-existence of Jesus as “image of God,” cf. the section below, “The Form of God: Philippians 2:6–11; 3:20–21.”
- 132 Qualifying somewhat the claims of Scroggs: “The believer is identified specifically with the resurrected humanity of the Messiah. Paul continually here, as well as in Rom. 5, refers to Christ in his resurrected state as ἄνθρωπος. This means, on the one hand, that no question can arise as to a possible deification of the believer through his eschatological existence, for the uniqueness of Christ as *kyrios* is nowhere compromised. On the other hand it suggests Paul’s main concern with his Adamic Christology, to speak of the believer’s future human existence. The parallelism in verse 49 speaks also against any attempt to water down the identity between Christ and believer which would affirm that the believer will possess only a reflection of Christ’s resurrected glory. To bear the image of the man of dust means to exist in the same nature as the fallen Adam; to bear the image of the man of heaven must be understood in a similar manner”; *The Last Adam*, 88–89. What Scroggs overlooks is that the stress on ἄνθρωπος serves to explain the corporate character of each figure, the fact that humanity is taken up in their destinies; the nature of those destinies is another matter. The same qualifications apply to Blackwell, *Christosis*, 218. That Paul does not parse the divine and human natures of Christ here is perhaps evident in v. 45: “the last Adam became a life-giving spirit,” on which cf. the statement of Penna: “Now, the attribution of this verb and of this activity in a Christological sense to the last Adam

Paul's discussion of the earthly and heavenly body points without embarrassment to the condition of Adam straight from the potter's lathe, as it were.¹³³ As one possessing a corruptible body (v. 42) taken from the dust of the earth (v. 47), death was according to nature. Paul, however, does not take the natural for granted: Death is experienced as an enemy (vv. 54–55). And Paul knows that Adam is in close company with the nemesis, for he said earlier in the same chapter, "Death came through a human being" (δι' ἀνθρώπου θάνατος, v. 21). These contrary emphases, between death as according to nature and death as an enemy, can best be explored by bearing in mind the narratives of Gen 1–3, for the tension is already there in the creation of Adam from the dust to which he must return because he broke God's commandment and lost the opportunity to eat from the tree of life and become like one of the divine beings in whose image he was made. In this story, Paul finds the natural body, which corrupts on its own, the reality of death as punishment for the breaking of a commandment, and the proffer of eternal life as an unrealized aspect of creation in the image of God. First Corinthians 15:56 probably contains a hint that Paul has these additional narrative details in mind ("The sting of death is sin, and the power of sin is the law"),¹³⁴ as Romans will confirm. Death is, therefore, at once natural (or participatory) and punitive (or forensic).¹³⁵ These contrary

makes of him a being set on a footing of equality with God himself"; Penna, "Adamic Christology," 220.

133 Rightly, Fitzmyer: "There is not even a hint here that Adam is being considered 'as a sinner,' . . . he is simply the first human being created"; *First Corinthians*, 597. Contrast Ciampa and Rosner on vv. 42–44: "Corruption, or the condition of being perishable, is a result of the fall of humanity" and "We have all worn the (perishable and mortal) image of (fallen) Adam, but we will end up clothing ourselves with the (imperishable and immortal) image of Christ (the new Adam), in the resurrection from the dead"; Ciampa and Rosner, *First Corinthians*, 808, 826.

134 Cf. Rom 5:12ff. and 7:7–13, and, especially, Chris Vlachos, who however leaves unstated the relationship of this text to the discussion of the resurrection body and to juridical and participatory categories in Paul's thought: *The Law and the Knowledge of Good and Evil: The Edenic Background of the Catalytic Operation of the Law in Paul* (Eugene, OR: Pickwick Publications, 2009); idem, "Law, Sin, and Death: An Edenic Triad? An Examination with Reference to 1 Corinthians 15:56," *JETS* 47 (2004): 277–98.

135 Bultmann had distinguished three conceptions of death: the juristic (death as punishment), the organic (death as fruit of sin), and that conveyed in the present text, the equation of earthly with perishable. (for which he does not give a name); he regarded none of these to be in agreement with each other: cf. *Theology*, 249. The "organic" and the third (what is here called "natural") are not so different in the light of the full narrative of Gen 1–3. Scroggs subordinates the natural to that of Rom 5 (death as a result of sin), stating, "Paul does not necessarily see present nature as 'natural'"; cf. Scroggs, *The Last Adam*, 73.

emphases can be held together most readily in the context of the Adam narratives on which Paul is drawing.¹³⁶

Paul's discussion of the resurrection body presupposes that the duality of heaven and earth points typologically to the transcendent destiny of humankind. As Andrew Lincoln put it, there is "an inherent eschatological structure to creation."¹³⁷ Jesus, the second man, secures this destiny which God had all along intended for humanity, but which Adam and Eve never achieved. The human body is caught up in this destiny through transformation. Paul is guided by the Genesis narratives, from which he learns that the creation of the earthly Adam in the image of God evokes a transcendent heavenly reality in which Adam had the opportunity to participate. In signifying a bodily/filial relationship between God and human, the image can be determined by the Adam of dust or the Adam of heaven, the resurrected Christ. In the former expression, male and female are unequally related to the image (1 Cor 11:7), but in the latter this disadvantage has no relevance (Gal 3:28); the present body however is as yet still determined by Adam, and so Paul argues that social norms coherent

136 Martinus C. de Boer does not capture the nuances well when he writes, "Neither mortality nor corruption denotes for Paul a necessary and natural process of decay, nor can either of them be equated with death as such. Rather, human mortality refers to the susceptibility of living human beings with their 'natural' bodies to the onslaught of death. . . . It is thus because of death's great power that flesh and blood *cannot* inherit the kingdom of God and that corruption *does not* inherit incorruption"; *The Defeat of Death*, 132 (emphasis original). De Boer is guided by his isolation of two tracks of apocalyptic eschatology for heuristic purposes, the cosmological and the forensic: in the former death is viewed as a cosmic enemy, in the latter as the consequence of sin. The forensic conception of death as a consequence of the transgression of Adam is said to be characteristic of the latter track. In terms of Paul, the former is said to be primary and the latter to be solely the adoption of the framework of Paul's opponents for polemical purposes (and, hence, 15:56 is "seemingly parenthetical," p. 95). This dichotomous framing is puzzling in the light of the fact that he acknowledges the two frameworks are often found together. It does not enable us to see the intrinsic relationship of the "cosmological" or what I am calling participatory/natural and the forensic in Paul's thought. Cf. Martinus C. de Boer, *Galatians: A Commentary* (Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 2011), 31–34; idem, *The Defeat of Death*, 39–91. Likewise, Beker misses the narrative coherence: "The apocalyptic connection between sin and death (cf. Rom. 3:23) shifts here [1 Cor 15:42–44, 47–50] to a type of Hellenistic cosmology that posits a dualism between the supernatural sphere and the natural sphere"; Johan Christiaan Beker, *Paul the Apostle: The Triumph of God in Life and Thought* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1984), 220–21.

137 Lincoln, *Paradise Now and Not Yet*, 43.

with original creation still apply.¹³⁸ Throughout, Paul maintains the goodness of the present created world (cf. 1 Cor 8:5–6; 10:26),¹³⁹ including its theological pertinence (1 Cor 11:7; 15:35–49; also Rom 1:18–28), but he interprets it within a dialectic of natural and temporal hierarchies that points toward the transcendent destiny of humankind.¹⁴⁰ In the following text, we learn how that destiny is coming to pass already in the lives of believers.

Transformed into the Image: 2 Corinthians 3:18; 4:4, 6

With a thread spun from the cloth of Gen 1:26–27, in these three texts Paul weaves a picture of salvation into the identity of Christ in support and exposition of the surpassing glory of his own ministry in comparison with that of Moses (3:4–18; cf. Exod 34). Paul asserts boldly that believers are *already* in the process of being transformed into the glorious image of God, but he does so within a duality of the outer and inner; that is, in contrast to what is described in 1 Cor 15:45–50, the transformation is primarily a spiritual-noetic event whose effects are not yet felt on the constitution of the body, which is wasting away. 2 Corinthians 3:18, in particular, also has a prominent place in recent discussions of Pauline soteriology as a form of deification/theosis. It is, according to Stephen Finlan, “the most frankly theotic passage in Paul.”¹⁴¹ While the identification of that “same image” (τὴν αὐτὴν εἰκόνα) into which believers are

138 Independently, I have arrived at a conclusion that is structurally similar to Boyarin's regarding the relationship between Gal 3:28 and 1 Cor 11:7–12, only the discussion of 1 Cor 15:35–50 has enabled me to explain this relationship not primarily as the outgrowth of a body/spirit duality *per se* (although that duality is present; cf. below on the inner and outer man and the image in 2 Cor 3–4), informed by the conception of an original *disembodied* androgyn (cf. *Opif.* 134), but rather as the product of an overlapping eschatological and spatial duality in which the (non-fleshly) *embodiedness* of the prototype (in this case, the heavenly image of God; cf., further, Phil 3:20–21; Rom 8:29) is in fact a fundamental feature of Paul's thinking. Cf. Boyarin, *A Radical Jew*, 180–200.

139 Cf. Penna, “Adamic Christology,” 223–31. Creation is here viewed from a material rather than moral/spiritual aspect. Note the observation of Penna's: “Even before becoming the antitype of Adam on a very different level, Jesus himself was participant with and heir to the first Adam, i.e., simple ‘living soul’ or ‘psychic body.’ In light of this, it is hard to see the element of sin as an integral part of the definition of the ‘psychic body’” (p. 228).

140 Penna complains that the chronological stress on “first/then,” in which the first is viewed under the aspect of its creation by God, involves “an original conception of the history of salvation, which is however, systematically disregarded in the studies.” *Ibid.*, 229.

141 Stephen Finlan, “Can We Speak of Theosis in Paul?,” in *Partakers of the Divine Nature*, ed. Michael J. Christensen and Jeffery A. Wittung (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2008), 57.

being transformed permits more than a single possibility, on the basis of 2 Cor 4:4 and 6, most scholars¹⁴² argue that it is the image of Jesus himself.¹⁴³ Yet the identification of “the same image” as Jesus leaves undetermined what transformation into that image entails. For this, we must answer what it means for Paul, in this context, to call Jesus the “image of God.”

Jesus as the image of God it is widely agreed, refers in 2 Cor 4:4 to the revelatory function of Jesus, as the one through whom God, particularly, the “glory of God,” is known.¹⁴⁴ Thus Eltester remarks, “Christus als Eikon Gottes ist der die Erkenntnis Gottes ermöglichende. . . . Christus als Abbild Gottes ist also die Offenbarung und Repräsentation Gottes.”¹⁴⁵ Typically this has been taken to indicate that the heavenly existence of Christ is in view, as Jervell argues: “Die Ebenbildlichkeit Christi bezeichnet nicht die Menschlichkeit, sondern die Göttlichkeit Christi. Nicht der irdische Jesus, sondern der auferstandene

-
- 142 Notable exceptions are Wright, *Covenant*, 147; Linda L. Belleville, *Reflections of Glory: Paul's Polemical Use of the Moses-Doxa Tradition in 2 Corinthians 3:1–18*, JSNTSup 52 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1991), 290. For Wright, believers are being transformed into the same image as each other; for Belleville it is gospel ministers who are being transformed in such a fashion. The notion of reflection conveyed in the verb *κατοπτρίζομενοι* (whether understood to be explicit or implicit) then pertains to believers. A comparable emphasis on the communal aspect is made by Duff, who argues that believers are the mirror, but that the image into which they are being transformed is still Christ; Paul Brooks Duff, “Transformed ‘from Glory to Glory’: Paul’s Appeal to the Experience of His Readers in 2 Corinthians 3:18,” *JBL* 127 (2008): 773. Against the communal construal of this verse, cf. Rabens, *Holy Spirit and Ethics*, 178 n. 25. While the notion is contextually possible, there is little in the verse itself to commend such a reading.
- 143 This is supported by the terminology of “seeing” throughout. Just as Paul had spoken of “seeing the glory of the Lord as though reflected in a mirror” as the catalyst for transformation into that “same image” (3:18), he now speaks of those whose minds have been blinded “to keep them from *seeing* the light of the gospel of the glory of Christ, who is *the image of God* (εἰκὼν τοῦ θεοῦ)” (4:4). That thought is reprised almost immediately: as the “image of God,” the glory of God is manifest “in the face (ἐν προσώπῳ) of Jesus Christ” (4:6).
- 144 Eltester remarks, “Die Herrlichkeit Christi ist nichts anderes als die Herrlichkeit Gottes, die auf dem Angesichte Christi sichtbar wird”; Eltester, *Eikon*, 132. Similarly, Lorenzen comments, “Das Antlitz Christi ist Spiegelbild Gottes, weil auf ihm die Doxa Gottes sichtbar wird”; Lorenzen, *Eikon-Konzept*, 248.
- 145 Eltester, *Eikon*, 132–33. Likewise Jervell, *Imago Dei*, 214ff.; Barrett, *From First Adam to Last*, 97; S. Vernon McCasland, “‘The Image of God’ according to Paul,” *JBL* 69 (1950): 87–88; David J. A. Clines, “Image of God,” in Gerald F. Hawthorne, Ralph P. Martin, and Daniel G. Reid, eds., *Dictionary of Paul and His Letters* (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 1993), 426–28.

und erhöhte Herr, der Geist ist, ist die wahre Eikon Gottes.”¹⁴⁶ Christ, as “Gottebenbildlichkeit,” then, “ist ein Bekenntnis zu der Göttlichkeit Christi, zu seinem Einssein mit dem Vater.”¹⁴⁷ Both Jervell and Eltester broach the topic of pre-existence, suggesting that although they do not see it in view here, Paul’s use of the motif of the “image of God” is of a piece with other texts which do emphasize pre-existence (1 Cor 8:6; Col 1:15; Phil 2:6).¹⁴⁸

The view that Paul has in mind the heavenly glory of Christ has met with stern resistance, however, among those who think that by “the image of God” Paul refers to the perfect humanity of Jesus, who bears the εἰκών, as *the second Adam*—interpreted as a reference to his humanity. Robin Scroggs joined German scholars H. Windisch and W. G. Kümmel in giving expression to the view among English language scholars that Paul has in mind the humanity of Christ.¹⁴⁹ “When Paul relates the concept of εἰκών to Gen. 1, he suggests that Christ is the reality of true humanity. . . . Paul now knows Christ to be true man, and this means that Christ is the image and glory of God. . . . [H]is Lord is the regained humanity God intended to exist at creation.”¹⁵⁰ More recently, this view has been taken up especially by Gordon Fee, Stephanie Lorenzen, and Jonathan D. Worthington.¹⁵¹

The debate profoundly effects our understanding of Paul’s theological use of anthropogonic traditions—particularly, what it means to be transformed into the image. It is therefore necessary to indicate why I think that arguments in favour of Jesus’ restoring the *adamic* image of God in his humanity are without a basis in the text.

146 Jervell, *Imago Dei*, 332. Controversially, Jervell argued that Paul did not regard humanity to have been created in the image of God (“Der Mensch wurde nie gottebenbildlich geschaffen”); that Gen 1:27 had an exclusively Christological application in Paul (and through Christ to believers: “Nur die Glieder der christlichen Gemeinde sind gottebenbildlich”); so Jervell’s dismissal of the humanity of Christ in the present text is part of that cloth. *Ibid.*, 285, 284.

147 Jervell, *Imago Dei*, 333. Cf., too, Black, “Second Adam,” 174–75.

148 “Das in II Cor 4,4 nur vom Auferstandenen und nicht vom Präestenten die Rede ist, bedeutet keine sachliche Schwierigkeit; denn Präesistenz und Postexistenz entsprechen einander”; Eltester, *Eikon*, 134; cf. Jervell, *Imago Dei*, 333.

149 Hans Windisch, *Der Zweite Korintherbrief* (Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1924), 136f.

150 Scroggs, *The Last Adam*, 98–99.

151 For references, see below. Additionally, cf. Blackwell, *Christosis*, 193–97: “As God’s divine agent Christ reveals God as the ‘image of God’ only as he lives a human life, which the association with the creation language from Genesis 1–2 makes evident” (195); and Rowe, “New Testament Iconography,” 299–301.

There appear to be three arguments in favour of the perspective that Paul specifically has in view the humanity of Jesus when he speaks of the image in 2 Cor 3:18; 4:4 and 6. Fee argues programmatically for the entire Pauline corpus that “Paul uses this language [i.e., image of God] with regard to Christ *only* with regard to his being the divine image-bearer in his incarnation.” He is emphatic that no other use of the term “would make . . . sense as an echo of Gen 1–2.”¹⁵² Because he is divine, reasons Fee, Christ bears the (anthropological/*adamic*) image of God perfectly, the same image which is being *restored* (after its defacement in the fall) in believers’ transformation.¹⁵³ Lorenzen stresses that Paul’s rhetorical point to emphasize the paradoxical nature of the glory of God being expressed in weakness favours an emphasis on Jesus’ earthly humiliation: “dass Paulus im Kontext durchgängig die Doxa Gottes in der Schwachheit betont.”¹⁵⁴ Therefore, it is said to be appropriate to see εἰκών here as functioning within the second Adam motif, construed in terms of Jesus’ earthly life: “In dieser Hinsicht ist er auch auf Erden Prototyp für seine Anhänger und übernimmt die Funktion des Zweiten Adam.”¹⁵⁵ And Worthington adds the closely related stress that Jesus stands parallel to Moses, both of whom bore the glory of God in their face, and therefore the earthly-human nature of Jesus is in view.¹⁵⁶ Perhaps the most spirited defence of the anthropological construal of the image is made by Worthington, who regards as “spurious” any finding of a “Philonic-type use of the χαρά-concept whereby empirical man is distinguished from the actual (metaphysical) image, who is the pre-incarnate Jesus.”¹⁵⁷

152 Fee, *Pauline Christology*, 522–23. Emphasis original.

153 Ibid., 174–87; 519–20. A similarly strained attempt to parse the divine and human natures of Christ in this text—drawing on a reading of 1 Cor 11:7; 15:42–50 I have attempted to discredit above—is made by Scott J. Hafemann, *Paul, Moses, and the History of Israel: The Letter/Spirit Contrast and the Argument from Scripture in 2 Corinthians 3*, WUNT 81 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1995), 416–18. For a critique, cf. Litwa, “Theosis,” 122–28, though I think Litwa relies too much on a narrative of fall-restoration, as seen for instance in his treatment of 1 Cor 11:7. In distinction from Fee’s method, Hafemann applies “image” language to Christ’s deity, but insists that it is Christ as second Adam, i.e., in his humanity, to whom believers are being conformed.

154 Lorenzen, *Eikon-Konzept*, 253.

155 Ibid., for the whole argument, cf. pp. 211–55.

156 “Paul is presenting Jesus as someone who is historically *after* Moses, having a human ‘face’ that replaces Moses’. Thus not only is 4:4 like Paul’s own use of ‘image of God’ in 1 Cor. 11:7 in that he identifies the ‘image’ with the referent directly and immediately, but the referent in both passages is a human as the image”: Worthington, *Creation in Paul and Philo*, 158–59.

157 Ibid., 154 n. 62. Worthington puts 1 Cor 11:7 in opposition to this, where “man” is “the image and glory of God.” (He objects to “import[ing]” 1 Cor 11:3 into “this part” of the argument

The flaw in these arguments is that they conflate two distinct applications of the image of God, to which are correlated distinct uses of “Adam.” Where Paul in 1 Corinthians spoke of the “last Adam” (1 Cor 15:45) the reference was to Christ in his resurrection as the manifestation of the heavenly image in contrast to the earthly image of the first man. (Likewise 1 Cor 15:20–23 had Christ’s resurrection existence in view.) The concept of εἰκὼν was made to reflect the dualism of heaven and earth. In his earthly life Jesus implicitly shared the *adamic* image. Only in his heavenly resurrection life does he become the model for a new, glorified humanity (cf., too, Phil 3:21; Rom 8:29).¹⁵⁸ The same pattern holds in 2 Corinthians, except that Paul refers explicitly to but one εἰκὼν (= *pneumatic soma*/heavenly image) and introduces the dynamic of present, inward transformation into that image by the spirit (3:17–18).¹⁵⁹

The transformation into the image ἀπὸ δόξης εἰς δόξαν of 3:18 is taken up in 4:7–5:5. With the dualism of the inner and outer ἀνθρώπος (cf. 4:16), Paul preserves the same basic distinction between the two images of 1 Corinthians, the earthly and the heavenly, for the transformation into the (glorious heavenly) image presently affects only the “inner man” (ὁ ἔσω ἀνθρώπος, 4:16), which is the new element in 2 Corinthians, and its outcome (at death) is the putting on of the heavenly “house” (i.e., body) of glory (4:16–5:1). The present body, or “outer man” (ὁ ἔξω ἀνθρώπος, 4:16)—which Paul styles “jars of clay” (ὀστρακίνα σκεύη, 4:7), perhaps recalling “the man of dust” of 1 Cor 15:47¹⁶⁰—is “wasting

on the basis that it would “confuse Paul’s own revealed logic for the sake of a seemingly neater system”; *ibid.*). But this hardly means that man *as* the image of God is not modeled on some corresponding image. Cf. van Kooten’s point that Philo, who generally retained the preposition, could have easily omitted it (citing *Praem.* 114; *Prob.* 62); *Paul’s Anthropology*, 54. On the absence of the preposition in 1 Cor 11:7, cf. above, n. 59. Moreover, in my own construal of Paul’s understanding, he does not distinguish between the “true”=“metaphysical image” and a (physical) copy, but rather between the heavenly and earthly, which exist in a sort of mirrored relationship which has both ontological, typological, and eschatological dimensions. Unfortunately, Worthington devotes no sustained attention to 1 Cor 8:6; Phil 2:6; and Col 1:15.

158 The other relevant text here is Rom 5:14, where Adam is described as the type of “the one who is to come.” It is to be noted that Rom 5:12–21 compares Christ and Adam in moral-vocational terms and their distinct impact; here the concept of “last” or “second” Adam is not explicitly employed. This is because Jesus according to the flesh is in view (Rom 1:3; 8:3); what Jesus does in the flesh is preparatory to his becoming the somatic model of the new humanity.

159 If one accepts the aorist subjunctive reading in 1 Cor 15:49, then the latter concept was already implied there; cf. n. 122.

160 “Clay” and “dust” become interchangeable means of referring to the creation of Adam from the earth; cf. Job 4:19; 10:9; 33:6; 1QH^a XI 21–25; XX 27.

away” or even “destroyed” (4:16; 5:1). The earthly body, then, whether that of Jesus or the believer, does *not* constitute the glorious εἰκὼν Paul has in mind in 2 Corinthians. Nothing changes where Paul draws Jesus into the discussion in 4:10: “always carrying in the body the death of Jesus, so that the life of Jesus may also be made visible in our bodies” (v. 11 repeats the thought, with the notable change from σῶμα to θνητῇ σάρξ). In the afflictions Paul suffers as a minister of the gospel (“we are afflicted . . . perplexed . . . persecuted . . . struck down . . .”), he replicates the death of Jesus, but to the degree that he carries out his service (“afflicted . . . but not crushed . . . not driven to despair . . . not forsaken . . . not destroyed”), the life of Jesus is manifest. “Life” here refers not to the earthly sojourn of Jesus (marked here rather by “death of Jesus”), but to the resurrection power which brought him to life (cf. 4:7, 12, 14).

That Jesus in his resurrection glory is in view with the concept of εἰκὼν is confirmed by the fact that the real point of comparison is not between the ministries of Moses and of Jesus, despite the coincidence of πρόσωπον (3:7, 13; 4:6), but of Moses (and the Israelites) and Paul (and believers) (3:12–13). Whereas Moses concealed the fading glory from his face in the presence of the Israelites, Paul and the community of believers with faces (πρόσωπον) unveiled are being transformed into glory and greater glory (3:18). Scott Haffemann rightly points this out as well: “The comparison throughout 2 Cor. 3:7–18 is not between Moses and Christ as mediators of the glory of God, but between Moses and Paul,” and he adds a point which supports the argument here, that, rather, “Christ [is] equated with ὕμνη himself as the glory of God.”¹⁶¹

161 Hafemann, *Paul, Moses*, 416. (As pointed out above, n. 153, Hafemann incongruously goes on to construe the image into which believers are transformed as the anthropological image of a restored Adam.) Cf. also Wright, *Faithfulness*, 2:677–80. On the terms of the comparison involving Moses and Paul, cf. also Newman, *Glory-Christology*, 229. Macaskill also recognizes that Christ as εἰκὼν is identified as the heavenly glory of God. In relating this text to Rom 8:28–30 he stresses that conformation to the image of the Son is a matter of being “(re)made” not according to Adam but according to the heavenly image. Cf. Macaskill, *Union with Christ*, 230–32, 242. However, in relation to Phil 3:20–21 he writes, “if there are Adamic allusions, they are again to the fact that Adam was made ‘according to the image’ (i.e., he was patterned on Christ) and that such patterning is *restored* in believers” (247; emphasis added). Here Macaskill comes close to affirming what he has been intent on avoiding, that something which Adam lost (whether image or glory) defines the soteriological event of salvation. My reading differs by combining the cosmology of the duality of heaven and earth and the insight from Genesis that creation after the image seems to represent a potentiality to participate *further* in the divine life. In Christ this potential is realized, as the earthly image is conformed to the heavenly image; there is thus no need, in fact it is a distortion, to speak of a “restoration” of any of Adam’s qualities.

It is quite mistaken therefore to construe Paul's references to εἰκών in 2 Cor 3:18 and 4:4 and 6 in terms of the earthly, crucified body of Christ or to Jesus' bearing the (*adamic*/anthropological) image of God in his humanity. Neither the *somatic* connotation of εἰκών, nor the implicit reference to Gen 1:26–27, automatically qualifies the image in terms of the earthly *adamic* image.¹⁶² Instead, Jesus' earthly humiliation models the *circumstances* under which transformation into the glorious image occurs, but it is not itself, in the terms of Paul's present discussion, expressive of the image. This is why transformation presently occurs in the renewal of the inner man by the spirit, while the outer man wastes away. The same spirit that transforms the inner man acts as a "guarantee" (ἀρραβών, 5:5) of the completion of that transformation upon death in the resurrected body, when the dualism of the inner and outer is dissolved.¹⁶³ Thus an allusion to Gen 1:26–27 must be construed in terms of the heavenly reality which is the transcendent counterpart of Adam's image.

When Paul refers to Christ as the "image of God," we conclude, he has in mind the heavenly, glorified existence of Christ.¹⁶⁴

Having established that Christ as εἰκών speaks to the divine nature of the resurrected Jesus, we can return to 2 Cor 3:18 in order to plumb the significance

162 *Contra* Worthington, *Creation in Paul and Philo*, 158 n. 77, who strongly implies this first point.

163 Blackwell has a good discussion of this point: *Christosis*, 197–219; although he incorrectly reads "image of God" as a reference specifically to the *adamic* humanity of Jesus and in terms of the restoration of that image (pp. 193–97).

164 This conclusion finds broad support in the work of Newman, who argues that Paul identified Christ with the glory of God (כבוד יהוה, Ezek 1:28) as a result of Christ's appearance to him in glory on the road to Damascus: cf. Newman, *Glory-Christology*, 92–104, 201–4, 229–40, 244; cf. also below "The Form of God." Moreover, while Paul does not seem to make a point of it here, the thought is compatible with the pre-existence of Christ as the "image of God" and this may indeed have been assumed in Paul's argument in chapter 3 (pre-existence was already essentially asserted in 1 Cor 8:6; 10:4, 9), and yet since it has no necessary argumentative function there, we must be content merely to note that the assumption would facilitate the parallel between Moses and Paul, both of whom will have seen the glory of God qua "Christ," even if Moses' experience of that glory will have only been partial both objectively (cf. Exod 33:20–23; cf. 2 Cor 4:6) and subjectively (as per 2 Cor 3:7–13). If it is possible to see Christ in (at least some of) the references to "Lord" in 2 Cor 3:16–18, and if 3:16 is acknowledged to be a citation of Exod 34:34, then Paul makes an explicit claim for Christ's pre-existence. This identification of Lord as Jesus is uncertain, however, and many now rather follow James D. G. Dunn, "2 Corinthians 3:17: The Lord Is the Spirit," *JTS* 21 (1970): 309–20. For an attempt to interpret the text with the claim of pre-existence at the forefront, cf. Anthony T. Hanson, "The Midrash in 2 Corinthians 3: A Reconsideration," *JSN* 9 (1980): 2–28.

of the transformation Paul describes. The verse itself and the smaller unit of which it is a part (vv. 16–18) are riddled with exegetical difficulties; only what is necessary can be addressed. The translation of the NRSV basically reflects my own exegetical decisions:

And all of us, with unveiled faces, seeing the glory of the Lord as though reflected in a mirror (τὴν δόξαν κυρίου κατοπτρίζομενοι),¹⁶⁵ are being transformed into the same image (τὴν αὐτὴν εἰκόνα μεταμορφούμεθα) from one degree of glory to another (ἀπὸ δόξης εἰς δόξαν); for this comes from the Lord, the Spirit. (v. 18)

The points which are necessary to make are three.

First, the image into which believers are being transformed is Christ. The most likely antecedent of τὴν αὐτὴν εἰκόνα is that image implied in the verb

165 According to LSJ s.v., the verb κατοπτρίζω has the sense “to show as in a mirror or by reflection” and in the middle “look into a mirror, behold oneself in it” or “behold as in a mirror,” and parenthetically it is added of 2 Cor 3:16 “but here perhaps reflect.” BDAG, s.v., gives, “look at something as in a mirror, *contemplate something*,” citing Philo, *Leg.* 3.101 (μηδὲ κατοπτρισαίμην ἐν ἄλλῳ τινὶ τὴν σὴν ἰδέαν ἢ ἐν σοὶ τῷ θεῷ). Three ways of handling the verb are: (1) “reflect, mirror,” (2) “behold,” (3) “behold as in a mirror.” Given the prominence of the term κάτοπτρον in the papyri for “mirror” and the relatively infrequent use of the verb in this period, the “mirror” element is unlikely to have been lost (as in later Patristic readings); cf. Jan Lambrecht, “Transformation in 2 Cor 3:18,” *Bib* 64 (1983): 246–48. “Reflect” has notable support in the literature; cf. those cited in BDAG and more recently Belleville, *Reflections of Glory*, 273–96; Wright, *Covenant*, 180–85; Blackwell, *Christosis*, 185–88. However, the largely contextual arguments in favour of this view, namely, the contrast between Paul (and sometimes the community) and Moses, whose face is veiled, and the sense of the community as “letters,” reflecting Christ’s life (cf. 4:7–10), are far from decisive. Instead, the more immediate contrast between the “we all” (v. 18, i.e., the community) and the “sons of Israel” whose perception is veiled (vv. 13–16) provides for the simplest lexical sense of the verb, i.e., “behold.” The wider contextual expectation that Paul and the community of believers will also “reflect” the glory is provided for in the transformation into the image which is beheld in the mirror. Cf. especially Margaret E. Thrall, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Second Epistle to the Corinthians*, 2 vols., ICC (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1994), 1:290–92; also Annette Weissenrieder, “Der Blick in den Spiegel: 11 Kor 3,18 vor dem Hintergrund antiker Spiegeltheorien und ikonographischer Abbildungen,” in *Picturing the New Testament: Studies in Ancient Visual Images*, ed. Annette Weissenrieder, Friederike Wendt, and Petra von Gemünden, WUNT 193 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2005), 316–19; Murray J. Harris, *The Second Epistle to the Corinthians: A Commentary on the Greek Text*, NIGTC (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2005), 314; Duff, “Transformed,” 769 n. 48; Lorenzen, *Eikon-Konzept*, 228 n. 121.

κατοπτριζόμενοι and rendered explicit by the NRSV's "as though reflected in a mirror."¹⁶⁶ The image is therefore "the glory of the Lord." Surprisingly, given the context (cf. Exod 33:18–23; cf. Num 12:8 LXX), this is the first explicit reference to the glory of the Lord. While the concept of the "image" appears to be generated by the reference to the mirror, the choice of the mirror-metaphor appears deliberate as a mere four verses later Christ is identified as the image of God (4:4). Even if "Lord" is to be identified as the LORD of the Exodus text, the reference to the Lord's "glory," which the believer sees, must constitute a reference to Christ in view of 4:4 and 6:¹⁶⁷ Christ in his glory (δόξα τοῦ Χριστοῦ) is identified as "the image of God," and the "glory of God" is known "in the face of Jesus Christ." Following Paul's train of thought to its extraordinary conclusion, Thrall writes that "the *divine* nature as expressed in Christ as God's image is progressively expressed also in those who are transformed into the same image."¹⁶⁸ Believers are transformed into the same image as the divine Christ.

Second, this transformation is primarily viewed as a present process of inner renewal, but it culminates in total somatic conformity in the future. It is generally thought that the phrase ἀπὸ δόξης εἰς δόξαν refers to a gradual increase in degrees of glory or "progression from one state of glory to a further state."¹⁶⁹ Nevertheless, an oblique reference to the final state of the glorious body must remain a live possibility, since it is the state of glory *par excellence*, partially anticipated in Moses' shining face, and a point of discussion a short while later (4:17; 5:1–5).¹⁷⁰ Moreover, the organic connection between

166 So Thrall, 2 *Corinthians*, 1:285.

167 Ibid., 1:283.

168 Ibid., 286. Emphasis added. Litwa adds, "insofar as Christ can be called 'divine' as God's image, humanity, fully transformed into the 'same image' which Christ is (2 Cor 3:18...), can also be called 'divine'"; "Theosis," 125.

169 Thrall, 2 *Corinthians*, 1:286. It is tempting to suggest that these two states are the present inner renewal (cf. 4:16) and the future total transformation (4:17; 5:1–5), but the present tense of μεταμορφώω places a strain on that interpretation, since Paul later contrasts the inner renewal with the "wasting away" of the outer aspect of the person (4:16). Both δόξα, qualifying μεταμορφούμεθα, will apply to present experience, and therefore the sense of a gradual increase is to be preferred, probably in direct distinction to the fading glory on Moses' face (3:7–11). Cf. Harris, *Second Corinthians*, 316.

170 Murray Harris tries to hold these together, finally arguing *against* the likelihood that the sense is from glory received in regeneration to that received at the parousia in favour of "the nature or direction of the transformation" as a gradual increase. But then he states, "the ultimate δόξα, the last in the series ἀπὸ δόξης εἰς δόξαν, will be the believer's acquisition as the result of a final μετασχηματισμός, of τὸ σῶμα τῆς δόξης (Phil. 3:21; cf. Col. 3:4), a body suffused with the divine glory and perfectly adapted to the ecology of heaven (1 Cor. 15:43–44)"; cf. Harris, *Second Corinthians*, 316–17. Newman interprets the phrase

these two states (the present-inward and the future-outward) is indicated by the fact of the spirit's being the guarantee (ἄρραβών) of the latter (5:5) and the effective agent or cause,¹⁷¹ or perhaps origin,¹⁷² of the former (καθ' ἃπερ ἀπὸ κυρίου πνεύματος, 3:18).¹⁷³ The present transformation has a pronounced noetic character. Perception of glory is later characterized as "knowledge" of the gospel (4:6) and a "looking" at things that cannot be seen (4:18), whereas the "minds" of the unbelieving have been "blinded" (4:4). Romans 12:2, containing the one other occurrence of the verb, speaks of transformation "by the renewal of the mind." Indeed, μεταμορφούμεθα through "beholding in a mirror" in 3:18 is sometimes thought itself to metaphorically relate the noetic activity of meditation.¹⁷⁴ Thus, van Kooten's emphasis on transformation into the image of God as a pneumatic-noetic phenomenon captures an essential aspect of Paul's use of the concept, and adds an important qualification to Lorenzen's thesis that εἰκών is thoroughly a somatic concept in Paul.¹⁷⁵ While Paul's "image" language is more characteristically somatic, the pneumatic-noetic element has an inestimable importance, since it more readily expresses the present experience of salvation as enlightenment and moral enablement (2 Cor

in terms of a process that begins with the glory of Christ's initial appearance to Paul and culminates in the glory of final transformation of the body to Christ's glorious body; cf. Newman, *Glory-Christology*, 227.

171 Thrall, *2 Corinthians*, 1:286.

172 Harris, *Second Corinthians*, 317.

173 The translation of the prepositional phrase is disputed. *Ibid.*, 317–18, provides options. In any case, the reference to "spirit" is of a piece with the chapter's persistent opposition of "spirit" under the administration of the new covenant to ink, the letter, and the ministry of death (3:3, 6, 7–8), and it complements the pneumatic character of conversion described in vv. 15–17.

174 Cf. the evaluation of this topic in Rabens, *Holy Spirit and Ethics*, 175–90; Rabens suggests that conceptualizing "beholding in a mirror" as contemplation offers a *via media* between interpretations that stress transformation through understanding of the gospel on the hand or through a visionary encounter with Christ, the glory of God, on the other (p. 184).

175 The inter-connection between the pneumatic enlightenment and the pneumatic body of the resurrection is already hinted at in 1 Corinthians (cf. 2:10–31 and 15:45–49), but they are not connected by way of *eikon* terminology. Van Kooten (*Paul's Anthropology*) has ably highlighted the noetic component of transformation into the image of God and being made into the likeness of Christ as well as its Graeco-Roman antecedents, but he severely underplays the somatic component of the image throughout his monograph, both in the treatment of the Hebrew Bible (pp. 1–7) and especially Paul (cf. e.g., pp. 199–218), and he also works within the framework of the restoration of a lost or defaced image. It is in this connection—the somatic—that Paul's *eikon* language fits poorly within the framework of Hellenistic traditions of transformation into the divine image.

4:2; Rom 12:2).¹⁷⁶ This noetic component also recalls the Hodayot's celebration of an experience of glory which is somehow equated with or interpreted in terms of access to revealed knowledge in 1QH^a XVI 5–28.

Finally, it is vital to note how the theme of transformation into the image is interwoven into Paul's concept of new creation in the subsequent context.¹⁷⁷

¹⁷⁶ On the moral aspect, cf. Rabens, *Holy Spirit and Ethics*, 195–202; Litwa, *Transformed*, 220–23; idem, “Theosis,” 129–32. Litwa quips: “To become ‘the same image’ as the divine Christ is not, then, merely to become a shiny astral body in the eschatological sky. In this life, at least, it involves developing the self-subordinating virtues of Christ—assimilating to the Image of God—and thus to God himself”; *Transformed*, 223. This must be viewed in connection with participation in Christ as spelled out in 5:21. Cf. Plummer: “It is by union of Christ with man that Christ is identified with human sin, and it is by union of man with Christ that man is identified with Divine righteousness”; Alfred Plummer, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Second Epistle of St. Paul to the Corinthians*, ICC (New York: Scribner's, 1915), 187. The theme, which reaches back to Ireneaeus, has been emphasized in modern times under the rubric of “interchange” by Morna Hooker; cf. the several essays republished in *From Adam to Christ*, especially pp. 13–69. Lambrecht thinks that “the forensic term righteousness possesses here a moral connotation as well,” inasmuch as “a hidden imperative . . . is inherent” in “become the righteousness of God” (cf. 15b); Jan Lambrecht, *Second Corinthians*, SP (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1999), 101. Cf. Rom 8:3–4.

¹⁷⁷ A thorough-going reading of 4:7–5:21 as an explication of the restoration of the lost glory of Adam through the righteous suffering of Christ is undertaken by C. Marvin Pate, *Adam Christology as the Exegetical and Theological Substructure of 2 Corinthians 4:7–5:21* (Lanham, MD: University Press of America, 1991). There are problems with this interpretation: Its reliance on a maximalist construal of the presence of the myth of Adam's lost glory in Second Temple texts (relying heavily on Scroggs), often asserting its presence on the principle that the *Endzeit* = *Urzeit*; many of the purported echoes of Gen 1–3 detected in 2 Cor 4:7–5:21 (e.g., “man,” 4:16; “naked,” “groan,” “clothed,” 5:1–3; “life,” “Spirit,” 5:4, 5) are only convincing if one is committed to the pervasiveness and importance of the restoration of Adam's lost glory; and, finally, the matter that Paul's commitment to the myth is undermined by those texts where Paul most clearly does allude to Gen 1–3, either making nothing of the myth (as in Rom 5 and 7) or essentially contradicting it (as in 1 Cor 11:7 and 1 Cor 15:45–50, see above). On Rom 1:23 and 3:23, cf. n. 106 in Chapter 4 “Adam, Corruption, and the Cosmos.” My criticism of Pate is less about his detection of references to Gen 1–3, than about the interpretive grid he pushes them through. This is in evidence in 2 Cor 5:3, 4, for instance: “the nakedness that Paul desires to avoid . . . proceeds from his belief that Adam, originally clothed with divine glory, was divested of the covering because of his sin. In other words, Paul does not want to experience Adam's nakedness” (p. 115, citing 3 Bar. 6:16; 2 En. 22:8, 30:12; Gen. Rab. 20:12; Apoc. Mos. 20:1). Indeed, Pate admits that this is “a loose parallel,” but Paul's use of the word γυμνός to speak *not* of the present, earthly (i.e., *adamic*) soma (contra p. 146) but to some sort of post-mortem existence is counter-intuitive at best if the tradition Pate purports to be in the background is at all present to Paul's consciousness.

The mirror-generated reference to the “image” in 3:18 leads into Paul’s explicit identification of Christ as “the image of God” in 4:4, and then in 4:6 to recall Gen 1:3: “For it is God who said, ‘Let light shine out of darkness,’ who has shone in our hearts to give the light of the knowledge of the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ.” In this way the work of redemptive transformation which is accomplished through Christ, the image of God, is conceived as a continuation of God’s creative work at the beginning. There may be an echo of this original creation in the next verse where Paul speaks of having “this treasure” (likely the gospel, vv. 4, 6) ἐν ὀστρακίνοις σκεύεσιν (“in clay jars”), by which he may allude to Adam’s creation from dust as defining the character of present somatic existence (cf. σῶμα in vv. 8–11, 16–18).¹⁷⁸ Less ambiguously, Paul exclaims in 5:17, “So if anyone is in Christ, there is a new creation (καὶνὴ κτίσις): everything old (τὰ ἀρχαῖα) has passed away; see, everything has become new!”¹⁷⁹ Transformation into the image of Christ is part of Paul’s conceptuality of the new creation. According to the present interpretation of this transformation, new creation must not be regarded as signalling a “return” or “restoration” but rather a transcendence or completion, even, in some ways, an undoing or leaving behind of original creation.

We can conclude therefore that according to 2 Cor 3:18 believers, men and women alike (cf. Gal 3:28), are being transformed into the *divine* image of Christ by way of an inner renewal that for now leaves the outer body under the determination of the earthly Adam (2 Cor 4:16; hence 1 Cor 11:7–12) but which will culminate in total somatic conformation to the glorious Christ (2 Cor 4:17–5:1; 1 Cor 15:45–49). We found no compelling reason to interpret this transformation as the restoration of Adam’s lost glory and found it incompatible with the restoration of Adam’s image by way of its recovery in the humanity of Christ. Instead, in conformation to the divine image of Christ, the believer realizes the true intention of Adam’s creation in the image of God, a potential which Adam never realized.

178 Supporting this is Paul’s reference to the “first man” in 1 Cor 15:47 as ἐκ γῆς χοϊκός, where the same contrast between the present, earthly and future, heavenly existence is in play that can be seen in 4:16–5:10. It is not necessary to delve into the murky waters of chapter 5:1–10, but cf. Lincoln, *Paradise Now and Not Yet*, 59–71.

179 The debate continues whether Paul has in mind here a cosmic as well as an anthropological-ecclesiological new creation. As in Gal 6:15, the anthropological seems at the forefront, but from the dual standpoint of Pauline theology as a whole (1 Cor 7:31; 15:20–28; Rom 8:19–23) and the tradition-history of the term (“new creation,” e.g., Isa 43:18–19; 65:17; 66:22; Jub. 4:26; 1 En. 72:1; but cf. Jos. Asen. 8:10–11), it would be dubious to insist on the anthropological without any acknowledgement of the cosmic consequences of the Christ-event in Paul’s letters. The balance is captured by Adams, *Constructing the World*, 234–35; Thrall, 2 *Corinthians*, 1:420–28.

The Form of God: Philippians 2:6–11; 3:20–21

While it has been argued that the image of God as an epithet of Christ refers to his heavenly, glorified existence, it has not been necessary or possible to argue that *pre*-existence is in view with the title, although the implication was not far when Gen 1, including vv. 26–27, was seen to lend conceptual content both to the earthly and heavenly image. Philippians 2:6 offers the best chance of addressing this question within the undisputed letters of Paul, and Phil 3:20–21 contributes to the discussion by relating the aspect of the believer's conformation to the body of Christ's glory. I will argue that the basic category underlying these texts is the "image of God," and the effect will be to shore up several aspects of the argument to this point.¹⁸⁰

The statement that Christ existed in the form of God in Phil 2:6 has been at the centre of controversy, with some seeing a reference to the image of God here and then making different proposals for how Adam might be thought to relate to the text. The debate hinges on whether the semantic domain of *μορφή* overlaps with *εἰκών*, and thus whether the phrase that Christ *ἐν μορφῇ θεοῦ*

180 Both texts have generated debate concerning their form and provenance: Phil 3:20–21 in large measure due to its similarity to the earlier text has been thought to be a hymnic fragment; cf. John Henry Paul Reumann, "Philippians 3:20–21—A Hymnic Fragment?" *NTS* 30 (1984): 593–609. It is more common to consider 2:6–11 a hymn; it at least has an elevated poetic style. The classic work here is Ernst Lohmeyer, *Kyrios Jesus: Eine Untersuchung Zur Phil. 2, 5–11*, 2d. ed., SHAW 4 (Heidelberg: C. Winter, 1961). Philippians 2:6–11 constitutes as likely a text as any one might consider to have had a prehistory without explicit citation formula, and yet Paul seems capable of forging such a statement himself. What can be stated with confidence is that the text is thoroughly integrated into Paul's thought; Gorman argues that it is Paul's "master story"; at the very least, Wright seems justified on the basis of the content of Philippians itself (especially 3:2–21; but see also 1:20–24; 2:20–21, 25–30; 4:12) to argue that Paul had "the material and language of 2:5–11 in his blood stream"; Gorman, *Inhabiting the Cruciform God*, 9–39; idem, "Although/Because He Was in the Form of God: The Theological Significance of Paul's Master Story (Phil 2:6–11)," *JTS* 1 (2007): 147–70; Wright, *Covenant*, 59. Many recent commentators treat the "hymn" as Pauline (in origin): Stephen E. Fowl, *Philippians*, THNTC (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2005), 108–13; Markus N. A. Bockmuehl, *The Epistle to the Philippians*, BNTC (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publishers, 1998), 117–20; Peter Thomas O'Brien, *The Epistle to the Philippians: A Commentary on the Greek Text*, NIGTC (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1991), 198–202. An exception is Charles B. Cousar, *Philippians and Philemon: A Commentary*, NTL (Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 2009), 52–53, who follows what has perhaps been the majority critical opinion; cf. also Ralph P. Martin, *Carmen Christi: Phil 2:5–11 in Recent Interpretation and in the Setting of Early Christian Worship* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1983), 42–62, 287.

ὑπάρχων (2:6) evokes the εἰκὼν θεοῦ of Gen 1:27, and how. If a relationship to the image language of Gen 1:26–27 is granted, the question becomes whether Christ is seen as subsequent or prior to Adam. If the former is preferred, then we should speak of an Adam Christology in Paul, but if the latter is preferred, we ought rather to speak of an Image Christology, to which Adamic themes are structurally subordinate. I will argue that not only do “form” and “image” conceptuality overlap, but that Phil 2:6 identifies Christ as the pre-existent glorious image of God.

The case in favour of what I have termed an Image Christology has met with strong resistance on the part of Gordon Fee in his *Pauline Christology*. While Fee makes a strong case for the pre-existence of Christ based on Phil 2:6–7, he is exasperated by scholars who detect a semantic parallel in Gen 1:26–27: “there is not a single verbal connection of any kind between this passage and the Septuagint of Gen 1–3. The alleged semantic overlap between these two words [μορφή and εἰκὼν] is in fact a piece of scholarly mythology based on untenable semantics.”¹⁸¹ In a footnote, he makes additional arguments against the probability of “genuine semantic overlap”: (1) that the terms never appear together in the multiple entries of Louw and Nida’s *Greek-English Lexicon*, (2) that the matter is not simply about two words but the phrases μορφή θεοῦ and εἰκὼν θεοῦ, and (3) that since Paul elsewhere uses εἰκὼν of Christ to speak of “imaging God” the use of something other than the Septuagint’s word here suggests a different underlying concept.¹⁸² The first argument is inconsequential, and does not trump the abundant evidence of semantic overlap in the

181 Fee, *Pauline Christology*, 378–79. It has to be noted that he makes a dubious attempt to define μορφή as denoting “‘form’ or ‘shape’ *not usually in terms of the external features* by which something is recognized but of those characteristics and qualities that are essential to it.” Ibid., 378. Emphasis added. The explicit denial (“not usually in terms of external features”) runs contrary to the definitions supplied in BDAG (“form, outward appearance, shape”); Muraoka, GELS (“1. *Shape, form* . . . ; almost = ‘body’; 2. *A way sth or sbd looks*”); and LSJ (“*form, shape* . . . 2. *form, shape, figure* . . . 3. generally, *form, fashion, appearance* . . . 4. *a form, kind, sort*”). A positive emphasis on “essential qualities” is made in the definition supplied by Louw-Nida, though only citing Phil 2:6 as an example, and J. Behm, “μορφή,” *TDNT*, 4:743–44. Notably these last two definitions are offered without any attempt to contrast external appearance and inward reality. Fee cites Dave Steenburg in his favour, accurately to the effect that Steenburg thinks “*form of God*” militates against a comparison “to the *mundane* Adam of the Old Testament Genesis account” (85; emphasis added), but inaccurately to the effect that Steenburg considers the reason for this to be that the phrase connotes “the *visible aspect or appearance of God*” (78; emphasis added): “The Case against the Synonymy of Morphē and Eikōn,” *JSNT* 34 (1988): 77–86.

182 Fee, *Pauline Christology*, 379 n. 20.

co-occurrence of these terms in ancient Jewish (and other) texts, sometimes in contexts specifically reflecting on Gen 1:26–27 (see below). The second argument Fee borrows from Larry Hurtado, but Hurtado is specifically concerned with an allusion to *Adam* in the phrase *μορφὴ θεοῦ* and he in any case somewhat overstates the homogeneity in wording used to allude to Gen 1:26–27 in the sources, as well as neglects to note (as does Fee) the verbal link in *ὁμοίωμα* of Phil 2:7 to its cognate *ὁμοίωσις* of Gen 1:26, each related to the human being (though with inverse denotations).¹⁸³ The third argument assumes the conclusion, namely, that the words do not significantly overlap. We will be able to make a suggestion as to why *μορφή* might be used rather than *εἰκών* after we consider the semantic relationship between them.

George van Kooten has recently marshalled the evidence and made a convincing case for the semantic overlap of morphic and iconic language in ancient Greek, arguing that “the extent of the semantic and conceptual field of the divine image . . . is so large, and especially its inclusion of morphic language so important that, without much exaggeration, one could characterize Paul’s Christology and anthropology as ‘morphic.’”¹⁸⁴ Broadly, support for semantic-conceptual overlap can be found in Josephus who remarks, “[God’s] form (*μορφή*) and magnitude surpass our powers of description. No materials, however costly, are fit to make an image (*εἰκών*) of Him” (*C. Ap.* 2.190–191). Van Kooten also cites Philo, *Somn.* 1.232–233, 238; *Leg.* 210–211; 346; and Plutarch, *Alex. fort.* 335C–D; as well as *Ages.* 2.2. But particularly to the point are those texts highlighted by van Kooten that use morphic language in direct connection to Gen 1:26–27. Sibylline Oracles 3:8, the prime example, speaks of “Men, who have the form (*μορφήν*) which God moulded in his image (*ἐν εἰκόνι*)” (cf. also Sib. Or. 8:256–273). Celsus, in a passage preserved by Origen, criticizes the aniconism of Christians, remarking, “But if they mean that we ought not to suppose that images (*εἰκόνας*) are divine, because God has a different form (*εἶναι θεοῦ μορφήν*) . . . they have unwittingly refuted themselves. For they say

183 Larry W. Hurtado, *Lord Jesus Christ: Devotion to Jesus in Earliest Christianity* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2005), 121–23. Hurtado claims that “when subsequent writers wish to make allusions to this idea [the creation of humans according to the *eikōn theou*], they consistently use the *eikōn theou* phrase (Wisd. of Sol. 2:23; 7:26; Sir. 17:3)” (122). This overlooks the variability Genesis itself introduces in 1:26 which speaks both of creation *κατ’ εἰκόνα ἡμετέραν* as well as *ὁμοίωσιν* (which is reflected in Jas 3:9 without reference to *εἰκών*) and in 5:3 where *κατὰ τὴν ἰδέαν Ἀδάμ* is parallel to *κατὰ τὴν εἰκόνα αὐτοῦ* as well as texts in the DSS (4Q504 8 *recto* 4 כבוד כבודות בדמות; 4Q417 1 i 17 כדתבנית קדושים), not to mention the cases mentioned below in ancient literature where *μορφή* stands alongside *εἰκών* in connection to Gen 1:27.

184 Van Kooten, *Paul’s Anthropology*, 71.

that ‘God made man his own image (ἰδίαν εἰκόνα)’ and made man’s form like his own (τὸ δὲ εἶδος ἑαυτῷ)” (*Cels.* 7.62; Origen’s reply, 7.66, uses the same language; cf. also *Corp. herm.* 1.12).¹⁸⁵ Van Kooten concludes that “in the common idiom of images and their forms, ‘form’ refers either to the form of the image itself, or to the form which the image represents.”¹⁸⁶ The words occupy the same conceptual field, as van Kooten points out and clarifies, because *images have forms*. Paul’s own usage conforms to and confirms this: believers are predestined to be συμμόρφους τῆς εἰκόνος τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ (Rom 8:29), and they are already τὴν αὐτὴν εἰκόνα μεταμορφούμεθα (2 Cor 3:18).¹⁸⁷

Solid linguistic grounds therefore support the inference that the statement that Christ existed ἐν μορφῇ θεοῦ explicates part of Paul’s Image Christology.¹⁸⁸ But is the phrase “synonymous” with εἰκὼν θεοῦ, as van Kooten argues?¹⁸⁹ It may be, but it seems in this case there is an additional resonance to the phrase beyond the common idiom of images and their forms, which is clarified by the tradition-historical background of “form of God.” In this framework, the “form of God” refers specifically to the manifest “glory of God.” Dave Steenburg argues that “form of God” refers to “the visible aspect or appearance of God.”¹⁹⁰ Likewise, Markus Bockmuehl argues that it “denote[s] quite straightforwardly

185 Cited by Jervell, *Imago Dei*, 228–29; referred to by Steenburg, “Synonymity.” Mead’s translation: “But All-Father Mind, being Life and Light, did bring forth Man co-equal to Himself, with whom He fell in love, as being His own child; for he was beautiful beyond compare, the Image of his Sire. In very truth, God fell in love with his own Form; and on him did bestow all of His own formations.” To be noted here, too, is the overlapping of filial with *eikon* language.

186 Van Kooten, *Paul’s Anthropology*, 91.

187 Steenburg explains these texts with the comment, “the use of *symmorphon* and *metamorphomai* with regard to the Lord’s *eikōn* may convey that the transformation will involve specifically visible appearance—the chosen will come to manifest the divine beauty/splendor. Without these derivatives of *morphē* the explicit character of the conformity to the Lord’s *eikōn* remains ambiguous and unspecified”; Steenburg, “Synonymity,” 85. Steenburg’s analysis coheres with van Kooten’s in his stress that εἰκὼν lacks the heightened or (nearly) singular emphasis on the visual aspect conveyed by μορφή. This agrees in a way with van Kooten’s statement that “form” specifies the particular shape or characteristics of an image.

188 Unfortunately, van Kooten retains the language of “Adam Christology” and even speaks of “the pre-existent Adam from heaven,” but this reverses the relationship between the creation of Adam in the image of God and Christ’s pre-existence as the image of God; *Paul’s Anthropology*, 90.

189 Ibid., 89, with many others.

190 Steenburg, “Synonymity,” 78.

the visible identifying features” of Christ,¹⁹¹ and therefore speaks of him as revealing God’s own self in a visible aspect.¹⁹² Within the conceptuality of the image of God,¹⁹³ “form of God” therefore specifically connotes in Paul’s thought the *glorious* image of God (cf. 2 Cor 4:4 and Phil 3:21).¹⁹⁴ Ezekiel 1:26–28 supplies

- 191 Markus N. A. Bockmuehl, “‘The Form of God’ (Phil 2:6): Variations on a Theme of Jewish Mysticism,” *JTS* 48 (1997): 11; idem, *Philippians*, 127–29. Likewise, Fowl: “In this light, the ‘form’ of the God of Israel would be a reference to the glory, radiance, and splendor by which God’s majesty is made visible to humans. By locating Christ in this glory, Phil 2:6 places Christ within that aspect of God’s identity which is most visible to humans. In this regard, Paul’s description fits neatly with John 17:5, in which Christ shares in God’s eternal glory (cf. Heb 1:3);” *Philippians*, 92. Though Fowl cites 1 Cor 11:7; 2 Cor 3:18 and 4:6, he does not emphasize the notion of the “image of God.” Cf., also, Steenburg, “Synonymity”; and Jarl Fossum, “Jewish-Christian Christology and Jewish Mysticism,” *VC* 37 (1983): 263. Fossum points to the evidence of the interchangeability of *μορφή* and *δόξα* in the theophanies of the Septuagint: “In Job 4, 16, the *tēmûnâ*, ‘form,’ ‘appearance,’ of the divine spirit (*rûah*) which revealed itself to Eliphaz is rendered by *morphê* in the LXX. In Num. 12, 8, however, the LXX translates God’s *tēmûnâ*, which is beheld by Moses, with *doxa*. In the same way, Psalm 16, 15 renders God’s *tēmûnâ*, which the psalmist expects to be revealed unto salvation, by *doxa*. We also ought to note that, in the Christologically important text of Is. 52, 14, the *to’ar*, ‘form,’ ‘appearance,’ of the Servant is rendered by *morphê* by Aquila, but by *doxa* by the LXX.”
- 192 The preposition *ἐν*, perhaps carrying modal or circumstantial force, probably pictures Christ as wearing that glory like a garment (cf. Luke 7:25; generally, 1 En. 62:15; 2 En. 22:8). Cf. O’Brien, *Philippians*, 206, 209.
- 193 Pace Bockmuehl, “The Form of God,” 11, who downplays those traditions witnessing to overlapping of image and form motifs. The case for this has largely been made with reference to van Kooten above; but we should add other notable uses of *μορφή* including Dan 3:19 for the disfiguration of the king’s *פְּסִי* (*θ’*=*ᾧψις*); and Dan 4:36; 5:6, 9, 10; 7:28 where *θ’* has the word again for the disfiguration of the face=*פָּנָיו* (“brightness,” “splendour,” i.e., of one’s countenance).
- 194 Against this view, Hawthorne argues that *μορφή* as “glory” cannot be applied to the second, parallel use of the term in the phrase *μορφή δούλου* (2:7), but 1 Cor 15:40 suggests otherwise, and the objection only really carries weight if one argues that *μορφή* is synonymous with “glory” rather than that it connotes Christ’s glory by way of speaking of his manifest form. In that case, it very precisely parallels *μορφή δούλου*, which Paul describes as *ἐν ὁμοιώματι ἀνθρώπων* and *σχήματι ἀνθρώπου*; his second argument concerns the “lack of linguistic evidence” linking *μορφή* and *δόξα*, but this is already supplied in Phil 3:21 which reprises so much of the language and conceptuality in Phil 2:6–7 but with the addition of *δόξα* (cf., too, of course 2 Cor 3:18), not to mention the abundance of material in the LXX and Second Temple literature which describes the visible presence of God—which, we have seen, *μορφή θεοῦ* denotes—in terms of “glory” (e.g., Exod 24:16, 17; 33:18, 22; 40:34–35; Ezek 1:26–28; Sir 49:8; 1 En. 14:20); moreover, once the connection between *μορφή* and *εἰκὼν* is recognized, *δόξα* is but a short step away (1 Cor 11:7); cf. Gerald F. Hawthorne,

the connection between Christ as the “form (=glory) of God” and the “image of God” of Gen 1:26–27.¹⁹⁵ The vision of “the appearance of the likeness of the glory of the LORD” (ἡ ὁρασις ὁμοιωματος δόξης κυρίου/הַתְּבִינָה בְּכֹדֶד הַיְהוָה, Ezek 1:28) in the guise of “something that seemed like a human form” (ὁμοίωμα ὡς εἶδος ἀνθρώπου/אָדָם כְּמִצָּלָה, 1:26) is the tradition-counterpart to humankind’s creation in the image and likeness (דְמוּת) of God (Gen 1:27).¹⁹⁶ The glory of God, which Ezekiel strains to say, has a human likeness, is the image in which humankind is created (cf. Wis 2:23; 4Q504 8 *recto* 4). Later traditions (Jewish-mystical, Jewish-Christian, and Christian) attest to these connections,¹⁹⁷ but we must not simply equate those traditions with the Pauline concept, which (unlike some of them) is careful to restrict anthropological denotations specifically to Christ’s incarnation and subsequent glorification; in pre-existence, Christ is *not* “the heavenly man” or “heavenly Adam.”¹⁹⁸ Christ is the image of God, specifically, in form, the manifest glory of God.¹⁹⁹

This interpretation that “the form of God” refers to the manifest glory of God, or God’s glorious image, confirms that Christ’s pre-existence is in view,

“In the Form of God and Equal with God (Philippians 2:6),” in *Where Christology Began*, ed. Ralph P. Martin and Brian J. Dodd (Louisville, KY: Westminster, 1998), 100.

195 On the connection between these texts and the relevance for Paul’s use of the *eikon* concept, cf. Christian Stettler, *Der Kolosserhymnus: Untersuchungen zu Form, traditionsgeschichtlichem Hintergrund und Aussage von Kol 1,15–20*, WUNT 2/131 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2000), 111–14; Charles A. Gieschen, *Angelomorphic Christology: Antecedents and Early Evidence*, AGJU 42 (Leiden: Brill, 1998), 80–83, 337–39; Seyoon Kim, *The Origin of Paul’s Gospel*, 2nd. ed., WUNT 4 (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1984). Though not addressing directly the relationship to Phil 2:6, cf., too, on Ezek 1:26–28 and Christ as the glory of God in Paul’s thought, Newman, *Glory-Christology*, 92–104, 201–4, 235–40, 244.

196 Cf. Zimmerli, *Ezekiel*, 1:124, highlighting the connection to P in general.

197 Cf., e.g., Justin Martyr, *Dial.* 126.1 (also 61.1; 114; 127.4); *Poimandres* 12; *Ps. Clem. Hom.* xvii.7; *Rec.* 1.28. See, especially, Fossum, “Jewish-Christian Christology and Jewish Mysticism.”

198 We do not respect Ezekiel’s heavily qualified language in our speaking of “the heavenly man” and we neglect the context of Paul’s own use of the same phrase (1 Cor 15:48) by employing it of the pre-incarnate Christ. Gedaliahu A. G. Stroumsa, “Form(s) of God: Some Notes on Metatron and Christ,” *HTR* 76 (1983): 283–84; and Gilles Quispel, “Ezekiel 1:26 in Jewish Mysticism and Gnosis,” *VC* 34 (1980): 1–13, go astray on this point.

199 It is noteworthy that where the word “glory” does appear in this text (but recall Phil 3:21), the same blurring of identities is seen: “every tongue should confess that Jesus Christ is Lord, to the glory of God the Father” (v. 11). In the confession of the universal lordship of Christ, God is given glory. While “glory” here does not denote visible radiance, it remains the case that God’s glory is mediated through Christ.

which is now widely, but not universally, accepted.²⁰⁰ “The form of God” and the “form of a servant” are clearly two different states, the latter of which is explicitly defined anthropologically (2:7). It is most easily on the condition of pre-existence that the one who existed in the form of God can be said to make an act of will (ἡγέομαι, 2:6) away from equality with God and toward *kenosis*, i.e., to becoming human, and then to obedience to death.²⁰¹ This interpretation is necessitated if “form of God” refers to the heavenly glory of God. The conclusion is well grounded, therefore, that, rather than setting Christ within the history of Adam, the phrase ἐν μορφῇ θεοῦ sets Adam, modeled on the glorious image of God, within the story of Christ.²⁰²

200 Cf., e.g., Bockmuehl, “The Form of God,” 10; Bockmuehl also cites Jürgen Habermann, *Präexistenzaussagen im Neuen Testament*, Europäische Hochschulschriften (Frankfurt: Peter Lang, 1990), 115; Otfried Hofius, *Der Christushymnus Philipper 2:6–11: Untersuchungen zur Gestalt und Aussage eines urchristlichen Psalms*, WUNT 2/17 (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1991), 116–18.

201 For a grammatical argument in favour of this, cf. Fee, *Pauline Christology*, 376–77. Two alternative interpretations are offered by Dunn, either that the first movement (form of God to form of a servant) corresponds to the transition from Adam’s representative/mythic significance (*adam*=humankind) to Adam the patriarch (*adam*=the progenitor of Seth), or that it corresponds to the first of the two phases of Adam’s dying, so that the first movement (form of God to form of a servant) parallels Adam’s banishment from the garden and its tree of life (Gen 3:22–24; cf. 2:17) and the second (form of a servant to obedience to death) Adam’s physical corruption and death (Gen 5:5). It is doubtful, however, that such subtleties of the Genesis text are alluded to in so obscure a fashion. Cf. James D. G. Dunn, “Christ, Adam, and Preexistence,” in *Where Christology Began*, ed. Ralph P. Martin and Brian J. Dodd (Louisville, KY: Westminster, 1998), 78; idem, *The Theology of Paul the Apostle* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2006), 281–88; and idem, *Christology*, 114–21. For earlier interpretations not involving pre-existence, cf. George Howard, “Phil 2:6–11 and the Human Christ,” *CBQ* 40 (1978): 2; Jerome Murphy-O’Connor, “Christological Anthropology in Phil 2:6–11,” *RB* 83 (1976): 25–50; Charles H. Talbert, “The Problem of Pre-Existence in Philippians 2:6–11,” *JBL* 86 (1967): 141–53.

202 Despite the ready acceptance of pre-existence and the connection between “form of God” and “glory of God” by scholars such as Gorman, Fowl, and Bockmuehl, it is not clear that the insight has been fully exploited in the explanation of Christ’s “self-emptying.” Gorman can be taken as representative: *Inhabiting the Cruciform God*, 9–39; *ibid.*, “Paul’s Master Story.” He argues that inherent in Christ’s kenotic activity is not merely a concessive (“although being in the form of God...”) but a causal movement (“because he was...”). This causal sense is theologically appealing, and might make a good piece of *sachexegese* or *sensus plenior*, but it transgresses the semantics of “form of God,” which primarily highlights Christ as the revelation of God’s visible, even somatic, brilliance and glory. Kenosis, then, being concessive, communicates the divestiture of the glorious splendour of Christ for a “form of a servant.” Other aspects of Gorman’s argument start to break down, as

It is worth pausing to note that this interpretation of Christ's existence "in the form of God," namely speaking to his pre-existence as God's glorious image, is confirmed by 1 Cor 8:6 and Col 1:15. In the former text, Christ is identified as the medium of God's creative and salvific agency (δι' οὗ τὰ πάντα καὶ ἡμεῖς δι' αὐτοῦ) in a context where Christ displaces any ultimate significance of idols; the idea of the medium is expanded to include God's dealings with the Israelites, which Paul understands to have been conducted through Christ (1 Cor 10:4, 9; cf. v. 26; 15:20–28).²⁰³ There is clear conceptual overlap between the portrayal of Christ as "the genuine mediator between the divine and human worlds" and the image of God, which is confirmed when Paul does use the precise phrase of Christ to express similar concepts of mediation in 2 Cor 4:4.²⁰⁴ The coherence of these categories is most obvious in Col 1:15.²⁰⁵

This hymnic text²⁰⁶ describes Christ as "the image of the invisible God, the firstborn of all creation," which leads immediately to the elaboration (ἵνα): "for

when he states that *kenosis* (2:7) "should not be read as a reference to the divestiture of something (whether divinity itself or some divine attribute), or even as self-limitation regarding the use of divine attributes, but 'figuratively,' as a robust metaphor for total self-abandonment and self-giving, further explained by the attendant participial phrases 'taking on the form of a slave' and 'being born [found] in human likeness'"; *Inhabiting the Cruciform God*, 21. However, if "form of God" links Christ to the "glory" of God, there must be something more than figurative in his taking on the form of a servant, for "glory" in this iconic tradition is primarily visible presence. Likewise the reverse transformation described in Phil 3:21 from the "body of humiliation" into the "body of [Christ's] glory" cannot be metaphorical.

- 203 While 8:6 is often understood within the context of wisdom motifs, it is highly doubtful that wisdom is a controlling or exclusive category, i.e., one in which Paul simply sees Christ displacing wisdom. A recent and very literal example of this is provided by Cox, who argues that 1 Cor 8:6 was originally a Corinthian slogan about God and his Sophia, which Paul corrected by replacing the latter term with Christ; cf. Cox, *By the Same Word*, 148–58.
- 204 McDonough, *Christ as Creator*, 158–59. McDonough develops the argument by emphasizing that in the context Christ displaces idolatrous cults; Christ, it is implied, is the true image.
- 205 Fee notes the close connection between 1 Cor 8:6 and Col 1:15–20, noting that the two halves of the latter text look like an elaboration of the two διὰ phrases of 8:6; Fee, *Pauline Christology*, 299.
- 206 The authorship of Colossians remains in dispute, and to complicate matters, 1:15–20 have been regarded as an originally independent unit. Two presuppositions necessary to sustain the pertinence of the following text to the present argument seem well founded, however: Colossians, if not from Paul, stands very close to his thought and may be thought to represent (again minimally) an early, organic development or interpretation of his thought; and, secondly, 1:15–20 if not original to the letter, is coherently related to the

in him all things in heaven and on earth were created, things visible and invisible, whether thrones or dominions or rulers or powers—all things have been created through him and for him” (Col 1:15–16).²⁰⁷ While traditions associated with wisdom speculation appear to be reflected, we should understand the term “image of God” here to include a reference to the creation of humankind in Gen 1:26–27, alluded to also in Col 3:10, just as it does elsewhere in the Pauline corpus.²⁰⁸ Even here Fee takes this allusion to mean that Christ

main concerns of the text. Against Pauline authorship: Jerry L. Sumney, *Colossians: A Commentary*, NTL (Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 2008), 7–9; Margaret Y. MacDonald, *Colossians and Ephesians*, SP (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 2008), 6–9; Eduard Lohse, *Colossians and Philemon*, trans. William R. Poehlmann and Robert J. Karris, Hermeneia (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1971), 176–83. For the view that Timothy wrote it, under Paul’s authority: Eduard Schweizer, “Letter to the Colossians Neither Pauline nor Post-Pauline,” in *Pluralisme et oecuménisme en recherches théologiques*, ed. Yves Congar (Paris: Duculot, 1976), 3–16; idem, *The Letter to the Colossians: A Commentary*, trans. Andrew Chester (Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1982); James D. G. Dunn, *The Epistles to the Colossians and to Philemon: A Commentary on the Greek Text*, NIGTC (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1996), 35–39; David M. Hay, *Colossians*, ANTC (Abingdon Press, 2011), 19–24. For Pauline authorship: John Paul Heil, *Colossians: Encouragement to Walk in All Wisdom As Holy Ones in Christ* (Atlanta: SBL, 2010), 5–7; N. T. Wright, *The Epistles of Paul to the Colossians and Philemon*, TNTC (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1986), 31–34; C. F. D. Moule, *The Epistles to the Colossians and to Philemon*, CGTC (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1962), 13–14. For a recent and lengthy overview, coming down in favour of pseudepigraphy, cf. Robert McLachlan Wilson, *Colossians and Philemon*, ICC (London: T & T Clark, 2005), 8–63. On the hymn in particular, cf. Stettler, *Der Kolosserhymnus*.

207 Attempts to deny the pre-existence of Christ in either of these texts (1 Cor 8:6 and the present) are underwhelming. In the present text, Dunn asserts that the effect is not to assert the “actual (pre)existence” of Christ “prior to or in creation itself, but to affirm” that Christ, as the Torah for Ben Sira (24:23), “[is] to be understood as the climactic manifestation[s] of the preexistent divine wisdom, by which the world was created”; Dunn, *Colossians*, 89. The problem with this: in contrast to the text in Ben Sira, the hymn is about Christ, not wisdom, and while there are conceptual parallels (i.e., what is ascribed to Christ is elsewhere in Hellenistic traditions ascribed to wisdom), this hardly means that Christ is a double for wisdom.

208 Cf., e.g., Wis 7:25–26 and Philo, *Conf.* 146–167, discussed by Cox in relationship to Col 1:15; *By the Same Word*, 172–75. Unfortunately, Cox wants to impose a choice between Hellenistic wisdom traditions and Gen 1:26–27. Also, cf., C. F. Burney, “Christ as the APXH of Creation,” *JTS* 27 (1925): 160–77. For Burney, the poem applies to Christ what could be said of wisdom by combining Gen 1:1 and Prov 8:22, though he did not mention Gen 1:26–27. McDonough is suspicious of any significant impact from wisdom tradition on Col 1:15–20, and offers instead an interpretation based on a Messianic reading of Gen 1; cf. McDonough, *Christ as Creator*, 172–91. The attempt to force a choice between “Hellenistic”

“replaces Adam (Gen 1:26–27) as the true image bearer of God,” by which he means, “it is through the Son, who alone by way of his incarnation perfectly bears the Father’s image, that the unseen God is now known (cf. 2 Cor 4:4–6). Thus the eternal Son, whom the Father sent into the world (Gal 4:4), has restored the ‘image’ of God that the first Adam bore but that was defaced by the fall.”²⁰⁹ Standing as it does at the introduction to the hymn’s meditation on Christ’s role in the creation and maintenance of the cosmos, such a strictly anthropological and redemptive historical sense to the term “image of God” never seemed more unlikely. The text’s relationship to wisdom speculation has an important exegetical impact here, confirming that εἰκὼν τοῦ θεοῦ relates to the heavenly pre-existence of Christ. A reference to Gen 1:26–27 is not excluded by this background, if that text is understood to refer to the heavenly prototype of Adam.²¹⁰

and “biblical” influences is wrong-headed in this case, as it often is; instead, our efforts should be directed at spelling out how each have contributed to a new synthesis.

- 209 Fee, *Pauline Christology*, 299, 301. Does Col 3:10 imply that the image of God has been defaced or lost by a fall and restored in Christ? It is often thought so, as Fee sums up the text, “in the new creation the Son restores the ‘image of God’ in humankind that was lost in the first creation through human sin.” *Ibid.*, 303–4, 522 (here, 304). The full text reads: “Do not lie to one another, seeing that you have stripped off the old self (τὸν παλαιὸν ἄνθρωπον) with its practices and have clothed yourselves with the new self (τὸν νέον), which is being renewed (ἀνακαινούμενον) in knowledge (εἰς ἐπίγνωσιν) according to the image of its creator (κατ’ εἰκόνα τοῦ κτίσαντος αὐτόν). In that renewal (Gk: ὅπου) there is no longer Greek and Jew, circumcised and uncircumcised, barbarian, Scythian, slave and free; but Christ is all and in all!” (3:9–11). There are several points to note about the renewal here: The old self is not renewed, but replaced. It is the new self which is being (continually) renewed. That renewal is according to the image of its creator. Whatever the identity of the creator (God or Christ), the image must be Christ (cf. 1:15). Because the renewal applies not to the image of God in the strictly anthropological sense but in the Christological sense, there is no compulsion to read this in terms of the restoration of a lost or disfigured image. Helpful remarks are made by Moule, *Epistles*, 119–21. Besides evoking the concept (absent in Paul) of a lost original glory in humanity, Sumney accurately sums up the force of the text in Colossians: “This echo [of Gen 1:26] need not suggest that the primary thought of Colossians is that the new self . . . is humanity restored to the nature intended in creation. . . . Rather, Colossians refers to a new eschatological reality that goes beyond restoration of the original glory of humanity. The reality of which Colossians speaks includes participation in the resurrection of Christ and the new kind of life initiated with the acts of God in Christ”; Sumney, *Colossians*, 203.

- 210 Cf. Wright: “From all eternity Jesus had, in his very nature, been the ‘image of God’; reflecting perfectly the character and life of the Father”; *Colossians*, 70. And McDonough: “While a simple correspondence between Adam and Christ fails to explain the agent-of-creation motif, the idea that Christ is the archetypal glory/image of God in whose likeness Adam

Even having identified Christ as the glorious pre-existent image of God, weighing the anthropological implications of Phil 2:5–11 is no light task, and taken on its own would require a closer analysis of questions I have not addressed, either directly or in sufficient detail. What sort of relationship, for example, is envisaged between Jesus and God in the language of “form” and “equality” in 2:6, and what is the role of the difficult term *harpagmos*? How does the language of “form,” “likeness,” and “fashion” in v. 7 relate Jesus to humanity? And how precisely is the exaltation of Jesus as Lord in 2:9–11 related to (a) his pre-human existence and (b) his human identity?²¹¹ Without needing to sort through all the exegetical options, we can still make at least three significant observations.

First, Phil 2:5–11 can be situated within the context of archetypal images of self-deification. Outside of the Adam narrative itself, scholars have little explored this context.²¹² But Phil 2 shares enough in the constellation of motifs

was created opens up a fresh biblical–theological avenue. According to the author of our poem, Adam’s dominion was from the beginning derivative. Adam himself was a copy of Christ, the genuine image of God, and thus his dominion was a copy of the absolute dominion exercised by God’s anointed one”; McDonough, *Christ as Creator*, 183. Cf., too, Gregory E. Sterling, “The Image of God’: Becoming Like God in Philo, Paul, and Early Christianity,” in *Portraits of Jesus*, ed. Susan E. Myers, WUNT 2/321 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2012), 157–73.

211 Many consider ἴσα θεῷ to explicate (at last partly) ἐν μορφῇ θεοῦ and thus equality would be something which Christ had but did not take advantage of; cf. Roy W. Hoover, “The Harpagmos Enigma: A Philological Solution,” *HTR* 64 (1971): 118; Hawthorne, “Form of God,” 101; Gorman, *Inhabiting the Cruciform God*, 18; Bockmuehl, *Philippians*, 126. Alternatively, “equality with God” might be viewed as something within grasp, but not taken advantage of, and perhaps received from God as a consequence of his *kenosis* and submission to death (vv. 9–11); cf. C. A. Wanamaker, “Philippians 2.6–11: Son of God or Adamic Christology?” *NTS* 33 (1987): 179–93; Martin, *Carmen Christi*, xxi–xxiii. The positions are helpfully surveyed by Hawthorne, “Form of God.” On the difficult word *harpagmos*, cf. Hoover, “Harpagmos Enigma”; John Cochrane O’Neill, “Hoover on Harpagmos Reviewed, with a Modest Proposal Concerning Philippians 2:6,” *HTR* 81 (1988): 445–49; N. T. Wright, “Harpagmos and the Meaning of Philippians 2:5–11,” *JTS* 37 (1986): 321–52.

212 There has been some exploration along these lines; cf. the summary in Martin, *Carmen Christi*, 157–64. In contrast to the present approach which considers narrative patterns, Martin (159) considers the Adam–Christ parallel as an *alternative* background to narratives of self-deification. He does, however, note (158) the plausibility of the comparison (in the case he considers, between Christ and Lucifer/Satan) if ἀρπαγμός has the sense of *res rapienda* (that is, something yet to be seized), but I do not regard this as necessary. Even if ἀρπαγμός rather has the sense of *res rapta* (a thing seized), “equality with God” remains something which may be chosen (in clinging to) or deserted (in letting go, emptying), and this supplies the necessary minimum for a comparison with narratives

that we spelled out previously with regard to the prophetic similes and to the Hodayot's "Self-Glorification Psalm" to merit such a study.²¹³ No other figure to whom the type applies is so closely enfolded into the identity of God as Christ is made to be in the statement that he existed "in the form of God," but there is sufficient distinction between "God" and "Christ" in Paul's thought, including elements of subordination (1 Cor 11:3; 15:24–28), to make the comparison viable. As with all other instances of the type, there is the shared issue of a fraught status, one which may, narratively, seek its own sort of deification or accept the limitations given to it. The key point in the comparison to such narratives is that just as in the Self-Glorification Psalm the archetype is subverted by depicting super-exaltation as following not from seeking one's own advantage but from self-giving modeled in part on the Isaianic Servant of the LORD.²¹⁴ In the Christ-narrative, the choice not to grasp equality with God, and instead to empty himself,²¹⁵ has the culturally counter-intuitive and counter-type outcome of universal lordship.²¹⁶ The close association between Christ and the identity of God (i.e., God's very form) makes the entire drama

of self-deification. The *tertium comparationis* remains "the desire to rival God" (158), only the starting point is different.

- 213 Namely, the presence of a figure whose identity or status vis-à-vis divinity is explicitly negotiated with accompanying motifs of "grasping" for one's advantage, "equality with God," succumbing to death, and universal sovereignty. See the discussion in Chapter 2 under the heading of "Anthropology of Glory and the Self-Glorification Hymn." A similar constellation of motifs is used to characterize the end-time enemy of God; cf. Dan 11:36; 2 Thess 2:4; Rev 13:4–8.
- 214 Precise parallels on the lexical level remain debated, but their potential number is great enough to combine with the congruence of motifs of humiliation and suffering followed by exaltation, capped by the citation of Isa 45:23 in Phil 2:10, in order to make some association likely. Cf. L. Cerfaux, "Hymne au Christ—Serviteur de Dieu (Phil., II, 6–11 = Is., LII, 13–LIII, 12)," in *Recueil Lucien Cerfaux: études d'exégèse et d'histoire religieuse de Monsieur Cerfaux réunies à l'occasion de son soixante-dixième anniversaire*, vol. 2, BETL 6–7 (Gembloux: Duculot, 1954), 425–37; Joachim Jeremias, "Zu Phil 2:7: heauton ekenōsen," *NovT* 6 (1963): 182–88; Richard Bauckham, *God Crucified: Monotheism and Christology in the New Testament* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998), 56–61; Wright, *Faithfulness*, 2:680–89. The evidence is weighed by Bockmuehl, "The Form of God," 12–13.
- 215 Cf. the intriguing comments concerning ἀρπαγμός in this mythic tradition in Christopher Rowland and C. R. A. Morray-Jones, *The Mystery of God: Early Jewish Mysticism and the New Testament*, CRINT 12 (Leiden: Brill, 2009), 141.
- 216 The counter-imperial perspective of the text finds a natural home within these types of narratives; for a counter-imperial reading, cf. Gorman, *Inhabiting the Cruciform God*, 9–39; John Dominic Crossan and Jonathan L. Reed, *In Search of Paul: How Jesus' Apostle Opposed Rome's Empire with God's Kingdom* (San Francisco: HarperCollins, 2005), 288–91.

speak to the character of God, who through Christ enjoys not only majesty and glory but also gives these up for the sake of God's creatures. As Richard Bauckham notes, this too may be rooted in verbal links established by Isaiah between the servant and God who are both "exalted" and "lifted up" (נשא + רום, Isa 52:13; 6:1; 57:15).²¹⁷

Second to be noted is the homology that emerges between the two levels of Christ's existence, i.e., "form of God" and "form of a servant" (i.e., human form), and Paul's explicit εἰκών language in 1 Cor 15:49, i.e., "the image of the man of heaven" and "the image of the man of dust." Behind each duality stands the concept of the creation of humankind after the image of God—an earthly expression of a heavenly prototype. Since the form of God is a way of speaking of Christ as that heavenly image of God, it can be inferred that the creation of humankind according to the same image makes the downward metamorphosis of Christ a coherent prospect. The corollary to this is the possibility of the elevation of humankind on that same scale of divinity in consequence of the career of Christ.

Third, ample lexical agreements (underlined) and conceptual overlap (*italicized*) in Phil 3:20–21 confirm this possibility:

Phil 2:6–9

ὃς ἐν μορφῇ θεοῦ ὑπάρχων οὐχ ἄρπαγμόν
ἡγήσατο τὸ εἶναι ἴσα θεῷ, 7 ἀλλὰ ἑαυτὸν
ἐκένωσεν μορφὴν δούλου λαβών, ἐν
ὁμοιώματι ἀνθρώπων γενόμενος· καὶ
σχήματι εὐρέθεις ὡς ἄνθρωπος 8
ἐταπεινώσεν ἑαυτὸν γενόμενος ὑπήκοος
μέχρι θανάτου, θανάτου δὲ σταυροῦ. 9
διὸ καὶ ὁ θεὸς αὐτὸν ὑπερύψωσεν . . .

Phil 3:20–21

ἡμῶν γὰρ τὸ πολίτευμα ἐν οὐρανοῖς
ὑπάρχει, ἐξ οὗ καὶ σωτήρα ἀπεκ-
δεχόμεθα κύριον Ἰησοῦν Χριστόν, 21
ὃς μετασχηματίζει τὸ σῶμα τῆς
ταπεινώσεως ἡμῶν σύμμορφον τῷ
σώματι τῆς δόξης αὐτοῦ κατὰ τὴν
ἐνέργειαν τοῦ δύνασθαι αὐτὸν καὶ
ὑποτάξαι αὐτῷ τὰ πάντα.

While it is true that the common vocabulary in these passages works differently, it simply does not follow, as Stephen Fowl argues, "that 3:21 is not picking up the language of 2:6–8 in any significant way."²¹⁸ There are several reasons to think otherwise. In the first instance, Phil 2:6–11 was introduced as part of an exhortation to the Philippians to have the same mind—one focused not on the advantage of self but that of others—which was also in Christ (2:1–5),²¹⁹

217 The combination of verbs being rare; cf. Bauckham, *God Crucified*, 49–51.

218 Fowl, *Philippians*, 173. Contrast O'Brien, *Philippians*, 467–72.

219 This point has become controversial, especially since Ernst Käsemann, "Kritische Analyse von Phil 2:5–11," *ZTK* 47 (1950): 313–60; idem, "Critical Analysis of Philippians 2:5–11," *JTC* 5

so that in addressing Christ's *reversal* of status from humiliation to exaltation, Phil 2:6–11 invites the question how these events are related to the advantage of the Philippians. Will they, in patterning themselves after Christ, also share in his state of exaltation by virtue of his sharing in their state of lowliness? Second, the implication is in fact borne out. In the third chapter Paul appears to pattern his own biography on that of Christ as narrated in 2:6–11, just as he had encouraged the Philippians to pattern their own mindset. Now he adds the explicit goal that he would be found “in Christ,” knowing “the power of his resurrection,” and would press “toward the prize of the heavenly call (τῆς ἄνω κλήσεως)” by συμμορφιζόμενος τῷ θανάτῳ αὐτοῦ (“becoming like him in his death”) (Phil 3:8–14). The coincidence in language between Phil 2:6–9 and 3:20–21 does not seem accidental or incidental, therefore. As Morna Hooker observes, “It is almost as though Paul wrote: Christ humbled himself, becoming man, in order that by his humiliation we might become glorious in him.”²²⁰

We must note the extraordinary implications deriving from this association of Phil 2:5–11 and 3:20–21. The transformation of the body of humiliation²²¹ so that it conforms τῷ σώματι τῆς δόξης αὐτοῦ (3:21), brings the final state of the believer into close association with that divine existence which Christ had in pre-existence, expressed as the μορφῇ θεοῦ (2:6). Clearly, this “body of glory” to which believers are conformed is that of the resurrected, rather than pre-incarnate, Christ. Nevertheless, Jesus’ “body of glory” must be closely related to “the form of God” which he possessed in pre-existence and which identified

(1968): 45–88; followed by Martin, *Carmen Christi*; but see Larry Hurtado's reply, “Jesus as Lordly Example in Phil 2:5–11,” in *From Jesus to Paul: Studies in Honour of Francis Wright Beare*, ed. Peter Richardson and John C. Hurd (Waterloo, ON: Wilfrid Laurier University Press, 1984), 113–26. On the cosmological significance of δοῦλος (2:7), in distinction from Hurtado, see Nijay Gupta, “To Whom Was Christ a Slave (Phil 2:7)? Double Agency and the Specters of Sin and Death in Philippians,” *HBT* 32 (2010): 1–16.

220 Hooker, *From Adam to Christ*, 21; cf., also, pp. 46–47, 92–93, and 176–77.

221 Doble argues that this ταπεινώσεως is a state of mind adopted by those who pattern their lives after Christ who humbled himself (cf. 2:8). The “body of glory” is then received in consequence of this behaviour, just as Christ was exalted by God for his voluntary humiliation. This interpretation is certainly possible and it derives warrant from the broader context of 3:18–21 and the epistle as a whole (as Doble argues); cf. Peter Doble, “‘Vile Bodies’ or Transformed Persons? Philippians 3.21 in Context,” *JSNT* 86 (2002): 3–27. However, it seems better to allow the phrase to be more closely determined by its most immediate context, the very sentence in which it occurs, where there is both a clear emphasis on the constitution of the body (μετασχηματίζω, σύμμορφος) and a clear parallel between τὸ σῶμα τῆς ταπεινώσεως ἡμῶν and τῷ σώματι τῆς δόξης αὐτοῦ. 1 Corinthians 15:42–44, which as Doble recognizes is closely related to Phil 3:18–21, would then furnish a parallel in the contrast between the body sown and raised as one of ἀτιμία (“dishonour”) versus δόξα.

him as the glory of God. While there can be no question of a fusion of identity between the believer and Christ (cf. Phil 2:9–11), it is not going too far to say with Cousar that the body of the believer “undergoes a transformation from being one of humiliation to being *the body of the divine glory*.”²²² While this remains the eschatological hope of the Philippians, they are already members of the *πολίτευμα* (“commonwealth”) of heaven, which is to provide the governing norms of their behaviour (cf. 1:27; 3:18–21).²²³ This coheres with the emphasis of 2 Cor 3–4, where transformation into the image involves a present inward renewal, followed by the putting on of divine glory.

In light of these observations, the Christ-myth can be seen to tie weighty soteriological implications to traditions of anthropogony. I have argued that the conceptuality that underlies the notion of Christ’s “incarnation” (a downward metamorphosis) and the Philippians’ subsequent conformation to Christ’s exalted form is that of the image of God, i.e., a sort of scale of divinity where Christ occupies a singular high point and humankind a lower earthly double.²²⁴ The metaphor of the scale answers to that prospect in Gen 1–3 that creation in the image of God seems to invite the possibility of progressing further in one’s likeness to God. Instead of that prospect, however, humankind has become enslaved to the powers of creation rather than exercise order-bringing dominion over creation.²²⁵ In Christ, however, the anthropological *telos* is realized, and creation, too, reaches its fulfillment, as all creatures bow the knee to Christ (Phil 2:10–11) who, after the manner of Ps 8:7 (E: 6), subjects

222 Cousar, *Philippians*, 81. Emphasis added.

223 On *πολίτευμα*, cf. Lincoln, *Paradise Now and Not Yet*, 97–101. On this text, Lincoln also remarks: “Paul’s conception corresponds to the apocalyptic motif we have seen in which the benefits of salvation awaited at the end are already present in heaven (cf. 4 *Ezra* 7:14, 83; 13:18; 2 *Bar.* 21:12; 48:49; 52:7)” (101). Cf. also John 14:2; 2 Cor 5:1; Gal 4:26; Heb 12:22.

224 On the conception of divinity on a graded scale (“summodeism”), cf. Litwa, *Transformed*, 239–49.

225 I regard it likely that this enslavement is implied in Christ’s taking the *μορφήν δούλου* of 2:7; generally it suits the cosmological tenor of the passage and specifically the anthropological definition of the term itself in 2:7–8 (cf. Rom 8:3). The mention of Christ’s exaltation over the powers (implicitly) in 2:9–11 describes the end result and goal of this subjection on the part of Christ, and Phil 3:21, in citing Ps 8 (cf. n. 226), further situates these events in terms of the human drama with creation (recall the opening lines of that psalm). This, of course, resonates with the parallel text in 1 Cor 15:20–28, as well as Gal 4:3. Cf., now, Gupta, “Double Agency.” Gupta correctly describes Christ as a double-agent; that is, the whole text concerns Christ’s obedience to God, so that his becoming a servant of the powers must also be seen in that context. I do not, however, think it helpful to substitute reference to demonic powers with Sin and Death.

all things to himself (Phil 3:21).²²⁶ The evocation and transformation of myths of self-deification through the nexus of the servant motif ties anthropological hope into the counterpoint of the perennial creaturely problem of snatching for one's own divinity; according to the Christ-myth, it is in God's own self-giving that humankind participates in that likeness to God that was put within the grasp of Adam and Eve.

Adam, Christ, and the Cosmos: 1 Corinthians 15:20–28

With the present text our study takes us from a concern with the image of God *per se* to a strict focus on Adam's role in the cosmos. Whereas 1 Cor 15:45–50—which provided the framework of 2 Cor 3:18–4:6; Phil 2:6–11; and 3:20–21—drew the Adam/Christ correlation into a relationship of typological surfeit, 15:21–22 will draw an “analogy in contrast.”²²⁷ The difference corresponds to the appearance of εἰκὼν terminology in 1 Cor 15:45–50, which spoke of creation strictly from a material aspect, and its absence in 15:20–28, which looks at material conditions under the aspect of a simultaneously moral, vocational, and/or spiritual component; the εἰκὼν-concept is particularly apt to describe the material conditions of the body. And yet εἰκὼν conceptuality is not absent: it can be detected here in the same relationship that exists between “Let us make humankind in our image” and “let them have dominion . . .” (Gen 1:26). The motif of rule finds its rationale or justification in creation in the image, but it does not define it *per se*.²²⁸ The semantic overlap of “image” and filial categories, moreover, allows here for the consideration of the motif of rule under the more obviously personal and morally implicated category of sonship. These related discourses will allow us to see death, moreover, not primarily as some antecedent apocalyptic power, but rather the flourishing of a weed, the seeds of which were inherent in the (corruptible) creation itself and watered by the sin of Adam. Put plainly, as Paul construes it, the moral/

226 The words of Ps 8:7 LXX, πάντα ὑπέταξας ὑποκάτω τῶν ποδῶν αὐτοῦ, are most likely reflected in Phil 3:21, ὑποτάξαι αὐτῷ τὰ πάντα, as the parallel citation in 1 Cor 15:27 confirms. So, too, Lincoln, *Paradise Now and Not Yet*, 103.

227 N. A. Dahl, “Christ, Creation and the Church,” in *The Background of the New Testament and Its Eschatology*, ed. W. D. Davies and David Daube (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1964), 435.

228 The language used by Wright, but certainly not exclusive to him, of “fully bear[ing] the divine image” to express the concept of carrying out humankind's commission to rule confuses this relationship and does not respect the semantic contexts of Paul's use of the image concept; *Resurrection*, 334.

vocational component of Adam's creation in the image of God lies at the root of the usurpation of the cosmos by death, and it likewise enables the reclamation of the cosmos through death's nemesis, the resurrected Christ. These things are contained in 1 Cor 15:20–28 and borne out by the scriptural contexts reflected in Paul's argument.

Paul's concern throughout the text is with the distortion that death works on the cosmos. In two different but connected ways, Paul establishes the certainty of resurrection against its deniers in Corinth (v. 12). First, in vv. 20–24, Paul asserts the essential connection between the resurrection of Christ (which they ostensibly affirm: v. 11) and that of dead Christians (the object of their denial: vv. 12–19). Second, in vv. 25–28, he casts death in the role of a cosmic enemy-usurper (which may have been news to the Corinthians).²²⁹

The rootedness of the whole argument in traditions of anthropogony has been the source of some discussion. Negatively, while the Adam/Christ comparison inevitably draws attention to vv. 21–22, one sometimes fails to find any substantial discussion of vv. 23–28 in relation to *adamic*/anthropological themes.²³⁰ More helpfully, N. T. Wright emphasizes in relation to the entire pericope that “the human task and the messianic task . . . dovetail together,”²³¹ and Martin Meiser writes concerning v. 27, “Paulus . . . eine generalisierende Variante des Motives vom Verlust der Herrschaft Adams über die Natur kannte—dies würde erst durch Christus rückgängig gemacht.”²³² Finally, those stressing the “apocalyptic” nature of the text tend to highlight an anthropology of captivity and its soteriological consequences; de Boer, for example, writes, “The cosmological understanding of death underscores the point that salvation is and always will be God's *gift* . . . a gift bestowed in His

229 As de Boer remarks: *The Defeat of Death*, 121.

230 Cf. the comments Scroggs makes in justification of this: *The Last Adam*, 105–6. Similarly, Gordon Fee considers the Adam/Christ discussion of vv. 21–22 separately from vv. 23–28 because the former “is not a messianic theme”; *Pauline Christology*, 108 n. 66.

231 Wright, *Resurrection*, 336, 334. Emphasis original. For his most recent treatment, cf. *Paul and the Faithfulness of God*, Vol. 4 of *Christian Origins and the Question of God* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2013), 2:733–37, 1063–66. C. K. Barrett, likewise comments in relation to v. 25, “Messiah and Man can thus be used to interpret each other”: *First Corinthians*, 359; cf., too, his *From First Adam to Last*, 101–2. Aslo, Dunn, *Christology*, 109; Black, “Second Adam,” 173.

232 Martin Meiser, “Die paulischen Adamaussagen im Kontext frühjüdischer und frühchristlicher Literatur,” in *Jüdische Schriften in ihrem antik-jüdischen und urchristlichen Kontext*, ed. Hermann Lichtenberger and Gerbern S. Oegema, Studien zu den Jüdischen Schriften aus hellenistisch-römischer Zeit (Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus, 2002), 389. He cites Jub. 3:28; 2 En. 58:4; Apoc. Mos. 10:1ff.

cosmological-apocalyptic *triumph* over death through the Lordship of the crucified and resurrected Christ.”²³³ However, the inability of humanity outside of Christ to affect its own rescue, true as it seems to be to Paul, must not be allowed to overshadow other anthropological presuppositions of the text—which are also rooted in traditions of creation—namely, the original anthropological task of exercising dominion over creation, the momentous cosmic import of the vocation to rule, and the assumption of these functions within the role of the Messiah.²³⁴

The Adam/Christ correlation of vv. 21–22, which doubtless assumes the narrative of Gen 1–3 in the background, is Paul’s first use of the topos, and it invites reflection on the broader anthropological ramifications of the entire unit of which it is a part, particularly up to v. 28.²³⁵ Of the three remaining texts that seem to be at play in these verses—Daniel chs. 2 and 7; Ps 110:1 (LXX 109:1); and Ps 8:7 (LXX 8:6)—not one of them is consistently regarded by scholars to be present with scriptural force in Paul’s argument.²³⁶ Most, however, recognize the citation of Ps 8 in v. 27, where Paul leaves a clear signal of his awareness of the words’ textual provenance—namely, the statement ὅταν δὲ εἴπῃ, which immediately follows and marks the words.²³⁷ Psalm 110:1, words of which

233 De Boer, *The Defeat of Death*, 184–85. Emphasis original.

234 In a largely neglected article, of 1972, Rudolphe Morissette drew out many similar points basing his argument predominately on the appearance of Ps 8:7 (E: 6) in v. 27, which he saw as further defining Christ’s role as the new man of v. 21; cf. Rodolphe Morissette, “La citation du Psaume [8:7b] dans 1 Corinthiens,” *ScEs* 24 (1972): 313–42.

235 Νυνὶ δὲ of verse 20 clearly marks a transition, which both concludes the previous unit, vv. 12–19, and sets up the claim (Christ’s resurrection as firstfruits) for which vv. 21–22 are the logical explanation (assuring the believers’ resurrection from Christ’s), vv. 23–28 the temporal elaboration (asserting an order of events over a period of time), and vv. 29–34 the practical ramifications. The change in the nature of the argument at v. 29 shifts the argument from the type of considerations we are exploring. The text permits various analyses of its logic and structure: cf., e.g., Anders Eriksson, “Elaboration of Argument in 1 Cor 15:20–34,” *SEA* 64 (1999): 101–14; Scott M. Lewis, *So That God May Be All in All: The Apocalyptic Message of 1 Corinthians 15,12–34* (Rome: Gregorian University Press, 1998), 23–74; C. E. Hill, “Paul’s Understanding of Christ’s Kingdom in I Corinthians 15:20–28,” *NovT* 30 (1988): 297–320; Morissette, “La citation.”

236 De Boer speaks of the two Psalm texts as “scriptural citations” but argues that the Corinthians would not have heard them as such but as part of a “christological creed or hymn”; *The Defeat of Death*, 116–18. He cites, especially, Eph 1:20–23 in support of this, and a connection between these scripture texts and baptism (1 Cor 15:29; Col 2:6–3:4; 1 Pet 3:21b–22), but the evidence does not necessitate this conclusion.

237 Likewise: Ciampa and Rosner, “1 Corinthians” in Gregory K. Beale and Donald A. Carson, eds., *Commentary on the New Testament Use of the Old Testament* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 2007), 745; E. Earle Ellis, *Paul’s Use of the Old Testament* (Edinburgh: Oliver and Boyd,

appear in v. 25, is even less accepted as carrying scriptural force, but a few considerations suggest that, though the words are unmarked, Paul at least would be cognizant of their scriptural pedigree.²³⁸ Finally, Daniel chapters 2 and 7 are often completely ignored,²³⁹ but strong contextual factors also suggest that book's influence, even if it is in no way cited or alluded to as a source.²⁴⁰ These texts (including Gen 1–3) share two related themes: a concern with God's royal representative and with the exercise of dominion within the context of potentially (or actually) disruptive forces. The overlap in themes can hardly be accidental given the content of 1 Cor 15:20–28. The most obviously “anthropogonic” of these texts, Gen 1–3 and the eighth Psalm, are the most clearly marked scriptural inter-texts in vv. 20–28, and they bracket the entire discussion.

The anthropological origins of mortality and resurrection are the explicit focus of the Adam/Christ contrast, and the identity of each man discloses their pivotal position at the beginning of two epochs, that of the original creation and that of its reclamation and fulfillment: “For since death came through a

1957), 96; Hays uses the language of “allusion” and “quotation” in relation to both texts; *Echoes of Scripture in the Letters of Paul* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1989), 86; idem, *First Corinthians*, 1BC (Louisville, KY: Westminster, 1997), 265.

238 Psalm 110 is among the most frequently cited texts in early Christian tradition, making it likely that both Paul and his hearers would recognize in these words the weight of Scripture; so Heil, *Rhetorical Role*, 206: “Because this adapted quotation would be so readily recognizable as scriptural to Paul’s audience, he does not need to formally introduce it as a scriptural quotation any more explicitly than he has.” The subject of the verb ὀψ, which on grammatical grounds appears to be Christ, but in the Psalm is God, looks in the hindsight of vv. 27–28 to be resolved in favour of God, further suggesting that the words appear with the force of Scripture; cf. Uta Heil, “Theo-logische Interpretation von 1 Kor 15,23–28,” *ZNW* 84 (1993): 27–35; Heil, *Rhetorical Role*, 207 n. 8; Fitzmyer, *First Corinthians*, 573; grammatical grounds, however, are decisive for Fee, *First Corinthians*, 575–76; for extended argument, cf. Jan Lambrecht, “Paul’s Christological Use of Scripture in 1 Cor. 15.20–28,” *NTS* 82 (1982): 502–27. On Psalm 110, cf. David M. Hay, *Glory at the Right Hand: Psalm 110 in Early Christianity*, SBLMS 18 (Nashville: Abingdon, 1973). Cf. n. 252.

239 Daniel 2:44 is cited in the margin of 27th edition of the *Novum Testamentum Graece* next to v. 24 (though not in the 28th edition). Of course, Dan 7:13 is linked to Ps 110:1 in Mark 14:62 par. Matthew Black highlights the connection drawn between Ps 110:1 and Dan 7:26–27 in three related texts, the present one (15:24–27), Eph 1:20–21; and 1 Pet 3:22. Each also makes a connection between Christ’s ascension or session at God’s right hand and the defeat of angelic powers; “Pasai Exousiai Autō Hypotagēsontai,” in *Paul and Paulinism* (London: SPCK, 1982), 74–82. Wright calls attention to the importance of these Danielic traditions: *Resurrection*, 333–38.

240 The distinctiveness and prominence of the terms “father” and “son” in vv. 24 and 28 doubtless also reflect royal traditions such as 2 Sam 7:14 and Ps 2:7.

human being, the resurrection of the dead has also come through a human being; for as all die in Adam, so all will be made alive in Christ" (vv. 21–22). The Adam/Christ correlation emerges to support (ἐπειδὴ γάρ, v. 21) the claim that Christ has been raised as first fruits (ἀπαρχή)²⁴¹ of those who sleep (τῶν κοιμημένων, v. 20). The corporate significance of these two epochal figures means that they affect the fates of all (πάντες) who are in (ἐν) them (vv. 21–22). In the case of Adam, it is easy to see how this works: as the one from whom all humanity descends, his bodily nature—in this case, corruptibility—becomes a relic handed on from generation to generation (ἐν τῷ Ἀδὰμ πάντες ἀποθνήσκουσιν, v. 22).²⁴² It is less obvious in the context how ἐν τῷ Χριστῷ can have the same corporate significance,²⁴³ and the concept breaks down in the image of the first fruits (vv. 20, 24). Paul is more concerned to emphasize Christ as the representative human who secures the victory over death (δι' ἀνθρώπου ἀνάστασις νεκρῶν, 21) and finally vanquishes the enemy powers which Adam's disobedience unleashed on creation (vv. 24–28).²⁴⁴ In the context, the death

241 Cf. Andy Johnson, "Firstfruits and Death's Defeat: Metaphor in Paul's Rhetorical Strategy in 1 Cor 15:20–28," *WW* 16 (1996): 456–64.

242 As throughout 1 Corinthians, Adam's bodiliness is in view wherever he is detected (cf. 1 Cor 6:16; 11:7; 15:45–49).

243 This has been a perennial problem of scholarship; cf. the discussion in Dunn, *Theology*, 390–413. Probably, Paul simply assumes that persons have come to participate in Christ through the spirit as spelled out in 1 Cor 12:12–13; cf. 6:14–20; 10:1–4, 16–17. There may be a hint of this in the use of ζῶσιαι (v. 22) if it anticipates the statement in v. 45 that Christ became πνεῦμα ζῶσιαι; cf., e.g., Hill, "Christ's Kingdom," 306, emphasizing the connection to vv. 45 and 49. On participation, see now the comprehensive study of Macaskill, *Union with Christ*. Cf., too, n. 60 in Chapter 4, "Adam, Corruption, and the Cosmos."

244 A prominent minority reads the text as supporting Paul's belief in the salvation of all humanity; cf. de Boer, *The Defeat of Death*, 111–13. This is a leap beyond Paul's immediate focus which remains exclusively on believers (cf. v. 18: ἄρα καὶ οἱ κοιμηθέντες ἐν Χριστῷ ἀπώλοντο), those who are Christ's (οἱ τοῦ Χριστοῦ, v. 23). While especially v. 28 (God will be "all in all") might appear to affirm the equation of "all" who die in Adam with the "all" made alive in Christ, it is just as likely that the final state described is a product in part of the annihilation of all inimical powers, including human (cf. 1 Cor 1:18–29). The verb καταργέω in vv. 24 and 26 is appropriately rendered "destroy," "annihilate" (cf. BDAG s.v. 3; 1 Cor 6:13; 13:8, 11; Gal 5:11) and may reflect the context of Ps 110 (which is alluded to in v. 25), which speaks of more than the mere pacification of the kings' enemies (cf. vv. 5–6; see too Pss. Sol. 17:24); also supporting this argument is the use of the verb in parallel to ἀναίρῶ in the parallel context of 2 Thess 2:8 (cf. also 2 Thess 1:9 and the parallel statement in Rom 16:20). The transition to the more (potentially) irenic verb ὑποτάσσω in vv. 27–28 likewise probably reflects in part the more universal statement of human rule in Ps 8 (i.e., enemies are not only in view). If there is universalism in Paul, it is predicated on annihilation.

and resurrection of Christ appears as the answer to human “sins” (vv. 3, 17), so the inference is not far that human enslavement to death which is here traced to the first man (“through man, death”) was initiated by the first sin,²⁴⁵ although Paul does not make a point of highlighting the circumstances attending the event.²⁴⁶

Death’s status is owing to the fault of Adam. The personification of death as one of a number of cosmic ruler-enemies that occurs a little further on (v. 26; cf., too, 15:54–55) reflects two interrelated features of Paul’s thought. The first is that death is an elemental phenomenon, the fulfillment of a negative potentiality of the created, corruptible world (15:45–50), and the second is that behind the elemental structures of the world stand principalities and powers,²⁴⁷ personal agents who wreak havoc in the absence of a properly functioning

Not insignificantly, this makes better sense of Paul’s evangelistic efforts than does the proposal that he asserts the total universal renewal of all and everyone that has ever been.

245 Cf. Fitzmyer, *First Corinthians*, 569–70. The connection between Adam (and Eve) and mortality was probably already established; cf. Sir 25:24; 1QH^a XX 29–30; Sib. Or. 1:38–55; 2 Bar. 48:42–43; 54:15; 56:5–7.

246 As argued above, not only does v. 56 suggest that Paul assumes this fuller narrative but it also provides the key to grasping how Paul’s statements about death in the present text cohere with what is said in vv. 45–49. Here is a criticism to be made of an overall excellent discussion of the text: Jeromey Q. Martini, “An Examination of Paul’s Apocalyptic Narrative in First Corinthians 15:20–28,” *CTR* 8 (2011): 61 and n. 20. Martini offers no explanation for how a man “enables” death if this narrative is not assumed, and (with many others) he sees only dissonance in the statement of v. 56.

247 On the στοιχεῖα τοῦ κόσμου, not explicitly mentioned here, as referring primarily to the four (or five) elements but often in contextual association with their personification, cf. Eduard Schweizer, “Slaves of the Elements and Worshipers of Angels: Gal 4:3, 9 and Col 2:8, 18, 20,” *JBL* 107 (1988): 455–68; though one need not accept every aspect of his reconstructions of the situations in Galatia and Colossae. The following are texts which both name the elements (or use the word *stoicheia*) and indicate some kind of personification, deification, or worship thereof: Wis 7:17–19; 13:1–3; Philo, *Contempl.* 3–5; *Decal.* 53; Josephus, *B.J.* 6.47; Jub. 2:2; T. Ab. 13:11; Eph 2:2. While the elements might be personified, admittedly the word itself in Paul still retains a primary reference to the four (or five) elements—or the basic “stuff” of the cosmos; the linguistic development by which the word *stoicheia* would in itself indicate “spirits” (T. Sol. 18:1–2; cf. 2 En. 12:1; 14:3; 15:1; 16:7) had not yet occurred (thus, NRSV’s “elemental spirits” is unwarranted), though it was but a short jump; cf. Dunn, *Colossians*, 149–51. Additional scholarship defending this interpretation includes Dietrich Rusam, “Neue Belege zu den stoicheia tou kosmou (Gal 4:3, 9, Kol 2,8.20),” *ZNW* 83 (1992): 119–25; Edward Young Hincks, “The Meaning of the Phrase Ta Stoicheia Tou Kosmou in Gal. iv. 3 and Col. ii. 8,” *JBL* 15 (1896): 183–92; contrast, in different ways, Adams, *Constructing the World*, 228–30; Frank J. Matera, *Galatians*, SP (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1992); Richard N. Longenecker, *Galatians*, WBC 41 (Dallas: Word,

humanity (15:24–26; cf. Gal 4:3, 9). The personification of death, therefore, can be comprehended as a metonymy for Satan (cf. Heb 2:14), which answers to the particular rhetorical needs of Paul's argument, namely, to present death as the enemy to which the resurrection of Christ is the answer.²⁴⁸

In Paul's elaboration of the present cosmic rule of Christ (vv. 24–28), he does not leave behind the *adamic* topoi. Instead he defines the role of Christ, the Messiah, in cosmological terms which are taken over from the active role with which humanity is assigned in the task of bringing order to the cosmos in several of those very texts to which Paul cites or alludes (especially Gen 1–3 and Ps 8). As Messiah, Jesus does not simply represent Israel and his kingdom is not merely national; instead, he represents humanity and his kingdom is cosmic/universal. However, his reign is temporally delimited. The reign of Christ is situated within the order (τάγμα) established in the first fruits metaphor. His reign is portrayed as active in the present, that is, between his own resurrection and the harvest of those who are his, at which time the kingdom of Christ becomes the kingdom of God (vv. 23–28; cf. v. 50).²⁴⁹ It is primarily in his resurrection, rather than earthly, existence that Christ brings to fruition the *adamic* commission.

1990); Linda L. Belleville, "‘Under Law’: Structural Analysis and the Pauline Concept of Law in Galatians 3:21–4:11," *JSNT* 26 (1986): 64–69. Cf., also, n. 253.

248 If I am correct that death is a metonym for Satan, then both Bultmann's emphasis on Paul's demythologizing of death and de Boer's argument that Paul *mythologizes* death (as something apparently distinct from Satan or the devil) are misguided; cf. Bultmann, *Theology*, 257–59; de Boer, *The Defeat of Death*, 179, 183–84. Romans 16:20 confirms the interpretation offered here: "The God of peace will shortly crush Satan (συντρίψει τὸν σατάνην) under your feet." The text shares an interest in the future destruction of some superhuman power as well as the image of being placed under foot to describe that destruction. Rom 16:20 also seems reminiscent of Gen 3:21; it is hard to assess the difference in language as τηρέω (Gen 3:21) would be ill-suited to the construction with God as subject. Pointing in favour of such an allusion are 1 Cor 15:55–56; 2 Cor 11:3 (cf. 2:11; 4:4; 12:7) and Rom 7:7–12 which deal with sin and death while echoing an Edenic setting, including the presence of a non-human adversary in that story. In other texts, death stands parallel to terms which are not hypostatized (Rom 8:38) or are metonyms for more recognizable personal agents (Rom 5:17, 21). Cf., too, Stephen Westerholm, *Perspectives Old and New on Paul: The "Lutheran" Paul and His Critics* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2004), 394 (concerning s/Sin in particular).

249 For the chiliastic interpretation of this text, cf. Wilber B. Wallis, "Problem of an Intermediate Kingdom in 1 Corinthians 15:20–28," *JETS* 18 (1975): 229–42. For a strong and convincing counter-statement, cf. Hill, "Christ's Kingdom"; also, Fitzmyer, *First Corinthians*, 571–72.

Verses 24–28 can be laid out chiastically, and this structuring sheds some light on the scriptural content of Paul's statements. Grammatical cues (here set in brackets), highlighted by Charles E. Hill, serve to anchor this chiasm.²⁵⁰ The text begins as an expansion on "the end," εἴτα τὸ τέλος:²⁵¹

- v. 24 A (ὅταν) kingdom handed over to God and Father
 B (ὅταν) powers destroyed
 v. 25 C (γάρ) reign until all enemies defeated, Ps 110:1
 v. 26 D (asyndetic) death, the last enemy destroyed
 v. 27 C' (γάρ) all things subjected, Ps 8:7
 B' (ὅταν) an exception to subjection
 v. 28 A' (ὅταν) the subjection of the Son, God all in all

Chiasmic structure and context agree that Paul has his sights set on the problem of death, which appears in an unusual asyndetic clause, at the central position (D). At the frame (A, A') Paul defines the end in terms of the relationship of the agencies of Christ and God in respect to the creation and each other.²⁵² Moving toward the centre (B/B', C/C'; D) the present reign of Christ is

250 Hill, "Christ's Kingdom," 300–303; Hill refers to Wallis' not dissimilar structuring, but which is less focused on the grammatical markers, and which he discovered subsequent to his own analysis: Wallis, "Intermediate Kingdom," 242. Similar is Heil's structure though less constrained by the grammatical markers as well: Heil, "Theo-logische Interpretation von 1 Kor 15,23–28," 29. In 1972, Morissette detected a much simpler, but still chiasmic structure: A. Thesis (v. 24) B. Scriptural development (vv. 25–27) A. Reprise (v. 28); he found the same structure in vv. 20–23, with vv. 21–22 constituting the scriptural development; cf. Morissette, "La citation," 315–17.

251 Τέλος has been taken in three ways: 1) nominally, “the end” (with ἔσται implied); 2) adv. acc., “the end, finally”; 3) nominally, of the last in a series, “rest, remainder” (i.e., a third τάγμα); cf. BDAG s.v. 2a, bα, and 4. The first option (cf., too, 1 Cor 1:8; Matt 24:14) is suggested by the structure of the text, anticipating the goal of creation further elaborated in v. 28. Cf. Fitzmyer, *First Corinthians*, 571; Thiselton, *First Corinthians*, 1230–31; Conzelmann, *1 Corinthians*, 270–71. Εἴτε (v. 24) does not imply an interval between the resurrection of the believers (v. 23) and the end, but is rather immediately defined by the two ὅταν clauses which follow (the second of which must actually precede the first in time).

252 The matter of the agencies of Christ and God, particularly who is acting as subject of the verbs καταργήσῃ (v. 24), θῇ (v. 25), and ὑποτέτακται (v. 27) is ambiguous, although v. 28b (αὐτὸς ὁ υἱὸς ὑποταγέσεται τῷ ὑποτάξαντι αὐτῷ τὰ πάντα) indicates that at some point along the way (i.e., in vv. 24–27) Paul conceived of God as subject. Even so, there can be no question of the passivity of Christ: he is subject of the verbs βασιλεύειν (v. 25) and παραδιδῶ (v. 24) and he clearly performs a mediatory role. The ambiguity arises primarily where Paul invokes scripture (vv. 25 and 27) and in the hindsight of the theocentrism of v. 28. Paul

defined in terms of the destruction (καταργέω) of hostile powers (B, C, D) and then more broadly of the subjection (ὑποτάσσω) of all things to him (C', B').²⁵³ The structurally central point, the defeat of death (D), coincides temporally with the climactic point—when God becomes πάντα ἐν πᾶσιν. The vision of God's unmediated, comprehensive rule, which is achieved through the reign of Christ, brings to a final conclusion the drama whose cause lay back in vv. 22–23, where the failure of Adam (the 'son,' as it were, corresponding to "the Son") prevented creation from arriving at its intended fullness.²⁵⁴

It is in the outer layers of the argument (A-B, B'-A') that Danielic influences are most apparent. As noted, Nestle-Aland²⁷ refers to Dan 2:44 at the margin of 1 Cor 15:24; the texts share the notion of a divinely ordained kingdom²⁵⁵ that enacts the destruction of all anti-God governing forces, and Dan 2:45 implies the agency of God's intermediary (the "stone"). But it is Dan 7 that supplies the fullest parallels and explicitly describes the transaction between the divine figure and the mediator, to whom is given dominion ("the son of man," vv. 9–14), in a way that resembles the relationship between Son and Father in the present text (1 Cor 15:24, 28). Also highly suggestive are vv. 26–27, which describe the judgement on the eleventh/little horn of the fourth beast:

wants to stress that the rule of Christ, in contrast to that of death and the powers, accords fully with the will and plan of God (hence, the so-called δεῖ of divine necessity in v. 25). Cf. n. 238.

253 Paul uses the language of ἀρχαί, ἐξουσίαι, and δύναμαι (v. 24). The terms refer primarily to superhuman powers, but they have a counterpart in the socio-political structures of the world, as demonstrated by George Caird, *Principalities and Powers: A Study in Pauline Theology* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1956), 1–30. In themselves, the terms are neutral, although Paul is generally somewhat ambivalent concerning the status of angelic powers and here strictly deals with enemies (vv. 25–26). Cf. also Rom 8:38–39; Eph 1:20–22; 6:12; Col 1:16; 2:10, 15 (and the additional terms they employ); also belonging here are the στοιχεῖα (Gal 4:3, 9; Col 2:8, 20): cf. n. 247. Carr makes the unusual argument that the terms never refer to hostile demonic powers: Wesley Carr, *Angels and Principalities: The Pauline Phrase hai archai kai hai exousiai*, SNTSMS 42 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1981). Particularly debated is the identity of the ἄρχοντες of 1 Cor 2:6, 8 (human, angelic, both?). Bibliography is considerable but an excellent summary and good entry-point is provided by D. G. Reid, "Principalities and Powers," in *DPL*, 746–52.

254 Cf., too, the closely related traditions in the Similitudes (1 En. 45:1–3c; 55:3–4; 61:8; 62:1–6; 69:29), and the comments on these texts in Newman, *Glory-Christology*, 88–90. These traditions reflect a similar expansion on the Danielic vision, involving a figure of exalted, seemingly divine status, who metes out judgement in a context of redemption and recreation.

255 "His kingdom" (ἡ βασιλεία αὐτοῦ) in *Θ'* and simply "this kingdom" in *LXX* (αὕτη ἡ βασιλεία), which is closer to the *MT*'s מְלֻכּוּתוֹ ("the kingdom").

²⁶ The court will be seated, and his dominion (ܡܢܝܚܐ; LXX τὴν ἐξουσίαν; θ' τὴν ἀρχήν) will be taken away, for destruction and perdition until the end (ܡܕܝܢܐ; ἕως τέλους). ²⁷ Kingdom and dominion and the greatness [LXX adds καὶ τὴν ἀρχὴν πασῶν] of the kingdoms under all heaven were given to the people of the holy ones of the Most High. Its kingdom (i.e., the people's, ܡܠܟܐ) is an everlasting kingdom, and all the dominions (ܡܢܝܚܐ; LXX αἱ ἐξουσίαι; θ' αἱ ἀρχαί) will serve and obey (ܡܠܟܐ ܡܢ ܡܠܟܐ; LXX ὑποταγήσονται καὶ πειθαρχήσουσιν; θ' δουλεύουσιν καὶ ὑπακούονται) it (ܡܠܟܐ; αὐτῷ; θ' having omitted λαός = "him").²⁵⁶

Since Paul is not quoting or alluding to a specific phrase (or phrases) *per se* it is not necessary to sort out which textual tradition is most prominent. What is striking is the confluence of themes and vocabulary: An end (τέλος) marks the transition from the reign (ἐξουσία, ἀρχήν) of the enemy of God and God's people to the submission (ὑποτάσσω) of all authorities (πάσαι αἱ ἐξουσίαι/ἀρχαί) to God. The last note is especially prominent in the Greek versions (especially θ') where there is a shift in emphasis from the kingdom received by the saints to a final climactic stress on God's absolute rule over a pacified cosmos. With much the same language as Daniel, Paul portrays the enemies of God on a cosmic mytho-poetic scale, harkening back to the chaos myth.

Psalms 110 and 8 appear in parallel (C, C') at the inner levels, defining Christ's task in terms of the destruction and subordination of "all enemies" and "all things," respectively. Paul has also linked the texts by supplying the same phrasing of ὑπὸ τοὺς πόδας αὐτοῦ for each, and by the addition of the key word πᾶς to the words of Ps 110:1 in v. 25 from those of Ps 8 cited in v. 27. The synchronizing of Pss 8 and 110 does not merely indicate that Ps 8 has been read messianically, but that Ps 110 has been read with the cosmic-anthropological overtones of Ps 8.

The Christological and the anthropological mutually inform each other in this text, and reveal the close connection between the mediational role of humanity and that of Christ vis-à-vis the creation. When the passage is read holistically, that is, with a sense of the close connection of thought and themes throughout, illuminated by its scriptural underbelly, one can put forward the following claims concerning Paul's anthropogonic theology.

The failure of Adam inaugurates the hegemony of death. In the alignment of death with the cosmic rulers, authorities, and powers, and in the alignment

²⁵⁶ Trans.: John J. Collins, *Daniel*, Hermeneia (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1993), 276. On the difficulties with the Aramaic and Old Greek in this text, cf. T. J. Meadowcroft, *Aramaic Daniel and Greek Daniel: A Literary Comparison* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1995), 217–21.

of Christ's defeat and subjugation of the powers with the fulfillment of the human commission to rule, Paul contextualizes Adam's disobedience as a failure to govern after the manner of the description of Gen 1:26–28 and Ps 8:7 (E: 6). Both texts convey something of the drama involved in the task, Genesis by evoking the chaos myth (even if largely to discredit it) and introducing the cunning creature in the garden, and Ps 8 by evoking the same myth in its early part. By his failure, then, Adam gives the chaos myth a new lease on life, and Paul draws on the language and conceptuality of Daniel to depict the final defeat of the disordering powers.

Thus, Adam's task no less than his redemption falls into the hands of Christ. In fact, Adam's redemption is complete only when Christ fulfills Adam's task, which is what Paul has Christ currently doing in his present reign (1 Cor 15:25–27). Though not here, elsewhere in the epistle Paul speaks to the believer's participation in Christ's reign (with decidedly futuristic emphasis: 1:9; 2:9; 3:21–23; 4:8 [with irony]; 6:2–3). The anthropologic role of Christ, whereby not only Adam's redemption but also his task becomes Messianic business, speaks to the utterly depressed and oppressed condition of humanity (1:30; 4:7). This is underscored by the final fulfillment of this task only in the heavenly, superhuman career of Christ.

The completion of the commission to rule in the career of Christ is but an extension of his role in creation and history, whereby he mediates God's creative intentions and blessings to the cosmos (1 Cor 8:6; 10:4, 9).²⁵⁷ This is accented by the language Paul uses to speak of Christ and God. Christ is Son (ὁ υἱός, v. 28) to God who is Father (πατήρ, v. 24), his Sonship signifying his being God's agent in creation. Thus, Christ hands the kingdom (i.e., a pacified creation) τῷ θεῷ καὶ πατρί (v. 24) and in this Christ is subordinated to God as ὁ υἱός (v. 28). These relational terms are being made to reflect Christ's mediating role in creation.²⁵⁸ The work which Christ does as a new Adam, therefore, is a (re)creative work. This is compatible, incidentally, with image-Christology as a feature of pre-existence (cf. 1 Cor 15:49; 2 Cor 4:4, 6; Phil 2:6; Col 1:15–20).²⁵⁹

Finally, the cosmic *telos* is achieved when, with the subordination (ὑποτάσσω) of Son to Father, God pervades all: ἵνα ᾗ ὁ θεὸς πάντα ἐν πάσιν (v. 28). The root ταχ- and the adjective πᾶς, which have been prominent throughout, now combine in a furious crescendo to express the end-point to which God is directing creation. Contextually, the subordination of Son to Father represents

²⁵⁷ Cf. McDonough, *Christ as Creator*, 150–71.

²⁵⁸ Morissette, "La citation," 316–17.

²⁵⁹ Confirming the earlier argument *against* the view that Christ is the image of God *because he has become man*.

the culmination of the Son's work of cosmic pacification (cf. v. 24). The meaning of God being *πάντα ἐν πασιν* likewise lies in the immediate context. The cosmic powers that worked to obstruct the divine will (they are *ἐχθρά*) must be destroyed (*καταργέω*) and all things, including the Son, must be properly and finally ordered (*ὑποτάσσω*) under God, and then God will be "all in all." The imagined condition is one where God's will is done on 'earth' (i.e., the realm of the cosmos) as it is in 'heaven' (i.e., the realm of God's undisputed rule). All things will be directed to God without obstruction or need of mediation.²⁶⁰ Notably, this can only occur on the level of the cosmos when the heavenly powers obstructing God's will have been reduced to nothing (cf. "the god of this world," 2 Cor 4:4; cf. 1 Cor 2:6, 8; Eph 2:2; 6:12). In this state, the hardened dualism between earth and heaven, for which they are partly responsible, will be entirely transformed (as it is already in the process of being transcended in the church).²⁶¹ While the climactic phrase of 15:28 might be rendered "all things to all people" (RSV), the cosmic scope of this vision demands something like the more encompassing *alles in allen Dimensionen* ("everything in every dimension"), as Zeller argues.²⁶² Clearly, this is not a teleological pantheism, reducing all distinction between God and creation, but neither is this simply a triumph of divine will: Paul envisions a cosmic God-directedness, which can

260 Cf. Fitzmyer: "God as 'the goal or final cause of everything.'" "All will be ordered by God to himself directly, with no further need of mediation, not even of the 'kingdom' or the 'reign' of Christ"; *First Corinthians*, 575. Robertson and Plummer: "The meaning seems to be that there will no longer be need of a Mediator: all relations between Creator and creatures, between Father and offspring, will be direct"; *First Corinthians*, 358.

261 It is revealing to set the use of *πᾶς* in 15:28 alongside other metaphysically pertinent (especially prepositional) phrases in Corinthians (1 Cor 3:21–23; 8:6; 12:6; 2 Cor 5:17–18; cf., too, Rom 11:36); in particular, from the statement that *τὰ πάντα* exist *ἐκ* the Father and *διὰ* the Son (8:6), with the church alone being *εἰς* the Father (8:6), who in it "works" (*ἐνεργέω*) *τὰ πάντα ἐν πασιν* (12:6), to the climactic vision that God will "be" (*εἰμί*) cosmically [*τὰ πάντα ἐν πασιν* (15:28)], the picture emerges of a creation on the move toward unity or participation in God, with the church occupying a proleptic position as a microcosm of God's work in the world, existing harmoniously within and under the kingdom of Christ (15:20–24; Col 1:13; cf. Eph 1:20–23) in anticipation of the kingdom of God (15:28, 50). For a defence of this interpretation, cf. Lakey, *Image and Glory*, 69–96, 129–32. Also helpful are Adams, *Constructing the World*; Gregory E. Sterling, "Prepositional Metaphysics in Jewish Wisdom Speculation and Early Christian Liturgical Texts," *SPhilo* 9 (1997): 219–38; J. F. Maile, "Heaven, Heavenlies, Paradise," in *DPL*, 381–83; and J. Painter, "World, Cosmology," in *ibid.*, 979–82.

262 Dieter Zeller, "Die Formel einai panta en pasin (1 Kor 15,28)," *ZNW* 101 (2010): 152; cf., too, Lewis, *All in All*, 66–69.

be described as an immersion in the divine will (vv. 25–26) and the divine life (vv. 22, 25–26; 53–55).²⁶³

The interlinking of the redemptive and the cosmic within the task of the Son assumes not the restoration of an originally ideal/complete creation, but the bringing to completion of creation's telos through the assumption of the role of Adam within the task of Messiah. The redemptive is precursor to the cosmic, for the completion of the cosmos was not to be achieved by divine fiat alone, but together with the participation of God's image bearers.²⁶⁴ Drawing on the entire chapter of 1 Cor 15, the following points support this reading: Paul looks at creation and sees *signs* of its own telos (15:35–50); likewise, Adam's creation of corruptible stuff corresponds to his being given moral agency and vocation within creation's and his own becoming (15:21–22; 45–50); and the use of such texts as Ps 8:7 (E: 6) and implicitly Gen 1:26–28 to describe the task of the Messiah in relation to the cosmos defines that task as anthropological.

263 For traces of something like this more relational/mystical interpretation in the history of exegesis, cf. Joseph T. Lienhard, "The Exegesis of 1 Cor 15:24–28 from Marcellus of Ancyra to Theodoret of Cyrus," *VC* 37 (1983): 348–50, on Gregory of Nyssa's interpretation; Brother Casimir, "When (the Father) Will Subject All Things to (the Son): A Treatise on 1 Corinthians 15:28 by Saint Gregory of Nyssa," *Greek Orthodox Theological Review* 28 (1983): 1–25. For a theological treatment in a similar vein, drawing on first-century evidence, Gregory of Nyssa, Martin Luther, and Colin Gunton, cf. David E. Fredrickson, "God, Christ, and All Things in 1 Corinthians 15:28," *WW* 18 (1998): 254–63.

264 In composing these two sentences, I am conscious of my debt to some statements of Andrew Louth concerning the two arches of creation and redemption in Orthodox theology; cf. Andrew Louth, "The Place of Theosis in Orthodox Theology," in *Partakers of the Divine Nature: The History and Development of Deification in the Christian Traditions*, ed. Michael J. Christensen and Jeffery A. Wittung (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2008), 34–36.

Adam, Corruption, and the Cosmos: Anthropogony within Romans

If Edward Adams is correct about the relationship of the story of God and creation in Romans and Galatians we will be faced with a choice, either to reconsider elements of the argument heretofore, or to deal with tension between Romans and what we have discovered thus far. Adams suggests that “whereas in Romans a ‘fall’ (Genesis 3) that frustrates God’s original design for creation is the problem to be resolved, a ‘story of God and creation’ arising from Gal. 3:28 might have had (aspects of) the original design of creation (Genesis 1–2) as part of the complication to be undone.”¹ Although here construed as alternatives, we have already encountered the framework of thought within which these different emphases can be held together. It is the presupposition that Adam is given a constructive role in creation and that in failing this task Adam himself and creation are prevented from reaching their intended completion. With this framework, we would want to modify the language Adams employs to describe the different emphases of Paul’s thought. There is no “fall” from God’s original design—if that is understood as a property of ontic perfection—but rather a deviation from an original intention, from a point at which its fulfillment was only in process. The goodness but incompleteness of creation is affirmed and the bridge between the two is the fulfillment of the human commission. This is writ microcosmically in Adam’s body, which was and continues to be in his descendants the (earthly) image of God, but which also anticipates assimilation to the incorruptible image of the heavenly Son. This happens when Adam’s disobedience is corrected in the obedience of Christ. This construal of the primordial history has the advantage of offering a straightforward reading of texts which have often been ignored, marginalized, or uncomfortably read against the grain, such as Gal 3:28; 1 Cor 11:7; and 15:45–50, and it in fact shows a greater openness to the narratives of Gen 1–3 (or to traditions which have organically developed in association therewith) on the part of Paul than has usually been recognized. One significant hurdle remains, to see if and how this framework takes shape in the context of the unique emphases of Romans. The three texts in Romans that most clearly and extensively reflect anthropogonic traditions provide material aplenty for this task: in Rom 5:12–21 Paul sets the

1 Adams, “God and Creation,” 40–41.

momentous deeds of Adam and Christ in a typological relationship; in 7:7–12 Paul enfoldes events in Eden into his own identity; and in 8:18–23 he elaborates on the interconnected destinies of creation and humankind in a manner that combines his explicitly “relational” (prominent in Romans) and “image” discourses (prominent elsewhere).

Adam and Christ: Romans 5:12–21

Romans 5:12–21 has been construed to provide confirmation of the vitality of the doctrine of the fall or of Paul’s purported lack of interest in Adam’s original condition. At one extreme, Adam’s disobedience may be portrayed as an “irrational intrusion” that spoils his own beautified condition and a completed creation. At the other extreme, Adam may be portrayed merely as a convenient foil for Christ, whose only value is in signifying the destitute situation of humankind. Paul’s Adam-Christ comparison, however, has deeper roots in the narratives of Gen 1–3 than either scenario suggests. Three lenses will help us to gain a perspective on this important text. The consideration of “Adam, Sin, and Death”; “Adam and Law”; and “Adam, the Type” will allow us to move through the text roughly as its contents unfold.

Adam, Sin, and Death

Paul’s basic statement on the matter of Adam’s sin and its effects introduces the whole section at v. 12, and it is further unpacked in vv. 15–21, after an evidently important aside concerning the law in vv. 13–14, which returns as a topic in v. 20. The interpretation of v. 12 is complicated by a long history of debate concerning the nature and effects of Adam’s “fall” and by grammatical uncertainties. It will be argued that Paul’s appeal to Adam does not perform the function of a theodicy: he considers sin from an historical and phenomenological perspective, not that of its ultimate origins or grounds for existence; and he strikes a balance, almost a symmetry, between the condition of Adam and the baleful effects of his sin and the condition and responsibility of humanity that is uncongenial to theories which overload Adam’s sin with historically fracturous consequences, such as the origin of evil or the loss of a state of bliss and immortality.

In verse 12 Paul stakes out his basic claim concerning *adamic* humanity. The Greek text reads: Διὰ τοῦτο² ὥσπερ δι’ ἐνὸς ἀνθρώπου ἡ ἁμαρτία εἰς τὸν κόσμον

2 The initial phrase here seems only loosely connected to the preceding discussion; it may serve merely to highlight a change in thought or to indicate a logical inference from the

εἰσῆλθεν καὶ διὰ τῆς ἀμαρτίας ὁ θάνατος, καὶ οὕτως εἰς πάντας ἀνθρώπους ὁ θάνατος διῆλθεν, ἐφ' ᾧ πάντες ἥμαρτον. Despite some attempts to salvage the grammatical structure of the passage, most scholars, translators, and many ancient readers deal with anacoluthon here.³ Paul begins a comparison between events tied up in the one man Adam and (it is assumed) the man Christ, but never finds his way out of the protasis.⁴ The result is a bald statement of the darkness that has enveloped humanity. Paul states that “sin came into the world through one man, and death came through sin.”⁵ The κόσμος is not merely “the world of men, human life,”⁶ but also the whole socio-physical cosmos,⁷ as the mythic context of Paul’s utterance suggests (cf. Gen 3:17–19) and 5:17 intimates.⁸ The choice

preceding material, which supplies the grounds for that material (if there is life in Christ, 5:1–11, this is why, vv. 12–21).

- 3 With ὥστε Paul introduces a construction which is never completed; one expects οὕτως καὶ (the order of words is important) to complete the comparison (cf. v. 18, 19, 21; 6:4, 19; 11:30–31). So, e.g., Leander E. Keck, *Romans*, ANTC (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 2005), 147; N. T. Wright, *Romans*, vol. 10, NIB (Nashville: Abingdon, 1994), 525; Joseph A. Fitzmyer, *Romans*, AB (New York: Doubleday, 1993), 411; James D. G. Dunn, *Romans*, WBC (Dallas: Word Books, 1988), 1:273. Contrast Arland J. Hultgren, *Paul’s Letter to the Romans: A Commentary* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2011), 223–24; Thomas H. Tobin, “The Jewish Context of Rom 5:12–14,” *SPhilo* 13 (2001): 170–71; C. K. Barrett, *The Epistle to the Romans*, rev. ed., BNTC (London: Black, 1991), 103; John T. Kirby, “The Syntax of Romans 5:12: A Rhetorical Approach,” *NTS* 33 (1987): 283–86; Scroggs, *The Last Adam*, 79–80.
- 4 Cranfield argues that Paul suddenly realizes that he must first stress the radical *discontinuity* between “the one man” Adam and “the one man” Christ (hence vv. 15–17) before he can complete the analogy initiated in v. 12, but among other problems, that means vv. 13–14, which immediately disrupt the grammar, are yet a parenthesis to the parenthesis; C. E. B. Cranfield, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans*, ICC (London: T & T Clark, 1975), 1:272–73. It is better to see v. 15, taking its cue from τυπός (at the end of v. 14), as resuming the thought or direction, if not the grammar, of v. 12. Cf. Fitzmyer, *Romans*, 408.
- 5 Remarkably similar is Wis 2:23–24, “For God created us for incorruption, and made us in the image of his own eternity, but through the devil’s envy death entered the world, and those who belong to his company experience it.”
- 6 Pace Cranfield, *Romans*, 1:274; Adams, *Constructing the World*, 173; Ulrich Wilckens, *Der Brief an Die Römer*, EKK VI/1–3 (Zurich: Benziger, Neukirchener, 1978), 1:315 n. 1037.
- 7 Robert Jewett, *Romans: A Commentary*, Hermeneia (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2007), 376. This interpretation is broadly supported by the importance of creation motifs and creation theology generally in Romans (cf. Rom 1:18–23, 25; 4:17; 8:18–23; 9:19–24; 11:23–24, 36), for a survey of which, cf. Adams, *Constructing the World*, 151–93.
- 8 The statement that in Christ believers ἐν ζωῇ βασιλεύσουσιν (5:17) surely intimates their creation commission to rule over the world as well as anticipates Rom 8:18–23 (cf. 1 Cor 6:2). Thus the statement that “as the exposition proceeds, the determinative events, Adam’s sin and Christ’s act of obedience, are only ever conceived of as affecting human beings” is incorrect;

of the verb εἰσέρχουμαι does not suggest that Paul seeks to answer the question “why is there sin at all”—for Paul knows that the serpent is already there in the garden (cf. 2 Cor 11:3, “as the serpent deceived Eve”)—but rather “when and how did sin appear.” If Paul, then, does not engage in metaphysical speculation on the origin of sin and even assumes the presence of chaotic agents prior to the sin of Adam and Eve, then the sense in which sin enters the world through Adam is in the fateful existential impact of the failure of God’s chosen agent to continue God’s creative work of ordering creation. There is a suggestion, then, in the statement that “sin entered the world through one man,” of the organic connection between the destiny of human creature and created world, and of the chaotic effects of human misbehaviour on the created world which is intimated in Genesis and comes to prominence in 8:18–23. *Death is by definition a cosmic and not merely individual phenomenon.*⁹ The fate of the human body through human agency is a microcosm of the fate of creation through human agency. The treatment of sin and death as quasi-powers, indicated by the use of language that is (only sometimes) suitable of agents, speaks not so much to the mythologizing of these phenomena *per se* (as Sin and Death), but to the reversal of the position of responsibility and authority humankind was to have over creation. Because of sin, there is an inversion of roles; rather than “rule in life” (cf. 5:17) humankind is ruled by death, “death reigned” and “sin reigned in death” (vv. 14, 17, 21; 6:6, 9, 12; cf. 3:9). This limited personification probably capitalizes, as in 1 Cor 15:20–28, on the intimate relationship between spheres within creation and the superhuman powers that oversaw them, according to much speculation at the time, although such would only be implicit here.¹⁰ “Death,” however, primarily means literal, physical decay and

Adams, *Constructing the World*, 173. Moreover, this statement itself seems undermined by Adams’ development of the apocalyptic quality of Paul’s thought in this context when he states, “[sin and death] swept through the entire κόσμος, subjugating it and establishing their dominion over it” (ibid., 174).

- 9 Although not agreeing that “world” in v. 12 is the cosmos, Käsemann correctly says that “anthropology is the projection of cosmology”: “Because the world is not finally a neutral place but the field of contending powers, mankind both individually and socially becomes an object in the struggle and an exponent of the power that rules it”; but generally lost on his exegesis is the protological and eschatological sense in which one might also say, “cosmology is the projection of anthropology”; Ernst Käsemann, *Commentary on Romans* (London: SCM Press, 1980), 147, 150.
- 10 On Satan’s presence in this passage, cf. Richard H. Bell, *Deliver Us from Evil: Interpreting the Redemption from the Power of Satan in New Testament Theology*, WUNT 216 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2007), 233–35. Cf. nn. 247 and 253 in Chapter 3, “Adam and the Image of God.”

return to dust. Even so, death stands as a sign of a rupture in the relationship between humankind and God.

In the next clauses, Paul widens his view to address the relationship of the one to the many, adding, “and so (καὶ οὕτως) death spread to all humankind, ἐφ’ ᾧ all sinned.” These words have been the centre of controversy and debate from ancient to modern times. Interpretation is clouded because of the variety of ways in which Paul’s connective constructions may be interpreted. The initial καὶ οὕτως may indicate that death spread as a result of Adam’s sin or under like circumstances.¹¹ And ἐφ’ ᾧ has been the subject of as many as twelve interpretations, which break down into those which take it as a relative clause or as a conjunction.¹² But with the exception of Jewett,¹³ scholars have almost unanimously come down in favour of the conjunctive sense, with two alternatives emerging. Usually it is taken to mean that death spread to all *because* all have sinned.¹⁴ But Fitzmyer contends for a consecutive meaning, equivalent to the conjunction ὥστε: death spread to all “with the result that, so that” all have sinned.¹⁵ From here one enters a maze of opinions: Fitzmyer critiques the causal sense on the exegetical grounds that Paul then seems to say something different than what he said in 12 a-c, where he asserted that sin and death are owing to Adam (taking the initial καὶ οὕτως as expressing the “connection” between Adam and humanity, not merely a similarity in circumstances).¹⁶ But

-
- 11 Arguing for the latter sense is Keck, *Romans*, 147. He prefers the translation of the NIV, “in this way.”
 - 12 Eleven are catalogued by Fitzmyer, *Romans*, 413–17. Jewett’s (see below) makes twelve.
 - 13 Jewett sees this as a reference to the realm in which humans sin, the κόσμος of v. 12a and v. 13; *Romans*, 376. In view of the strength of the position for a conjunctive clause here, the distance separating the antecedent (κόσμος) and the pronoun (ᾧ) must count against this reading. The once influential Augustinian interpretation based on the Latin VL and Vg translation *in quo*, understood usually as a reference to Adam, has been widely abandoned.
 - 14 Here it is understood as equivalent to διότι or ἐπὶ τοῦτω ὅτι and is thought to cohere with parallel uses in Paul’s letters (2 Cor 5:4; Phil 3:12, and 4:10). Cf. BDAG, 365, and BDF §235.2, and most modern translations. Recently, Hultgren, *Romans*, 222.
 - 15 Cited in his *Romans* are Plutarch, *Cim.* 8.6.4 and Athenaeus, *Deipn.* 2.49d; Fitzmyer also contends that the causal construal of ἐφ’ ᾧ occurs *nowhere* prior to the 6th century CE; *Romans*, 416–17; *ibid.*, “The Consecutive Meaning of ἐφ’ ᾧ in Romans 5:12,” *NTS* 39 (1993): 321–39; followed by Tobin, “Jewish Context,” 171. While agreeing with Fitzmyer’s critique and the attestation of the consecutive sense, Jewett points to two of Fitzmyer’s examples which may not be strictly consecutive (Diogenes Laertius, *Vitae philos* 7.169.4–6; Plutarch, *Arat.* 44.4.1); *Romans*, 375–76.
 - 16 Instead, with ἐφ’ ᾧ, Fitzmyer argues, “Paul is expressing a result, the sequel to Adam’s baleful influence on humanity by the ratification of his sin in the sins of all individuals.

Wright criticizes Fitzmyer because the consecutive sense makes Paul say that death causes sin, “the opposite of what he actually says throughout, which is that sin causes death.”¹⁷ Keck splits the difference: he accepts Fitzmyer’s consecutive sense but shares Wright’s criticism of Fitzmyer’s interpretation. For Keck, the phrase indicates “the logical inference *from* the ubiquity of death,” i.e., death spread to all men so that it is *evident* that all sinned.¹⁸

Some perspective can be gained concerning the relationship of Rom 5:12c-d to 12a-b if two additional contexts are held in mind. First, account must be taken of the spiralling nature of the development of Paul’s theme, for in the ensuing context he often has occasion to restate the relationship between Adam and his descendants. Second, account must be taken of the context of Gen 2–3, which Paul doubtless has in mind.¹⁹

Paul turns from the one man who introduced sin and death to the “all” of humanity with the clause “and so death passed to all men.” There are good reasons within the logic of the verse itself, within the whole context of vv. 12–21, and within Gen 2–3, to see here not simply a statement which will compare the spread of death in the case of Adam and that of humanity (possibly implied in the NIV’s rendering “and in this way” and supported by Keck), but rather a statement of the *result* of the events tied to the one man upon all humanity. There is an organic connection between the events tied up in Adam and the fate of *adamic* humanity. This is already intimated in 12a-b in the statement that sin, and through it death, entered (εἰσῆλθεν) *into the world*. This cosmic entrance is spelled out in 12c-d, augmented by the choice of the complementary verb, “and so death spread (διῆλθεν) to all.” Glancing down at the development of Paul’s argument confirms this train of thought: “the many died through the one man’s trespass” (v. 15); “because of the one man’s trespass, death exercised dominion through that one” (v. 17). Recalling Gen 2–3 clarifies this organic connection between the one and the all, for the disobedience of Adam and Eve

He would thus be conceding to individual human sins a secondary causality or personal responsibility for death”; *Romans*, 416.

17 Wright, *Romans*, 10:527.

18 Keck, *Romans*, 148.

19 Light is cast on the subject by Richard H. Bell, “The Myth of Adam and the Myth of Christ in Romans 5:12–21,” in *Paul, Luke and the Graeco-Roman World: Essays in Honour of Alexander J. M. Wedderburn*, ed. Alf Christophersen et al., JSNTSup 217 (London: T & T Clark, 2003), 21–36. He approaches the topic from a theoretical perspective rather than in terms of the narrative of Gen 2–3 itself, which results in some different conclusions than those offered here. Generally, he does not pay enough attention to Adam as an historical figure in Paul and one may wonder if he has not overstated the extent to which the biblical tradition stresses God’s separation from creation.

entailed their seclusion from the place of the tree of life and their succumbing to their own finitude in death, the consequences of which were necessarily borne by their descendants. So death passed to all humankind as a result of its entrance into the world through the one human ancestor.

That statement is followed by a second, “with the result that (or “because”) all have sinned.” Whatever the precise connection, it is clear that Paul wants to establish that all are culpable (cf. 3:9; 3:20). The matter of individual responsibility is so important that he will immediately break his train of thought to explain why death continued to reign even over those who did not sin in the same manner as Adam (vv. 13–14).²⁰ On the other hand, Paul will also explicate the relationship between Adam and his descendants in terms which include them in his offence: “one trespass brought condemnation” (v. 16); “one man’s trespass led to condemnation for all” (v. 18); “by the one man’s disobedience the many were made (κατεστάθησαν) sinners” (v. 19). The first two of these statements (vv. 16, 18) can be understood to refer to the sentence of death which is pronounced on all humankind because of Adam’s disobedience, that is, all are borne into corruption and mortality because of Adam. The third statement (v. 19) might be understood to mean essentially the same thing if the verb καθίστημι can be granted a strictly legal sense: the many were given the status of sinners in that they suffered the condemnation fit for sinners (i.e., death) because of Adam. But probably the normal meaning of the word is operative here (cf. Acts 7:27; Jas 4:4): the many were made or became sinners as a result of the one man’s disobedience.²¹ Paul does not explain how this happened, but a little reflection on Gen 2–3 and Paul’s use of it suggest an answer.²² Paul’s argument assumes a reading of the Eden narrative as a trial that affects the destiny of humankind. Adam’s disobedience makes the many sinners because thereby he passes on his own creaturely qualities and limitations which guarantees that his descendants do as he did. This is dramatized in Rom 7:7–12, where, as we shall see, Paul appropriates the Edenic encounter with God’s demand—a proto-law—to speak generally of the human condition

20 Cf. A. J. M. Wedderburn, “Theological Structure of Romans 5:12,” *NTS* 19 (1973): 352, and his whole discussion on determination and individual responsibility beginning on p. 349.

21 Cf. Fitzmyer, *Romans*, 421.

22 Contrast the answer offered by Wedderburn, who explains 19a by appeal to 19b (the many are constituted righteous): “Just as the life that is in Christ comes as a gift to men, but as a gift which they must still receive, so the decree of death and a whole environment and pattern of life blighted by sin and forsaken by God are handed down to man from his ancestor, and yet he must responsibly make his own decision as to whether to follow his fellow men or remain true to God’s word and will”; “Theological Structure,” 353.

in a manner that assumes that Adam's created nature is shared by those who come from him.²³ Paul does not mean, therefore, that people are *born* sinners, only that they *become* sinners because of Adam. Paul rolls up the whole history of the effects of Adam's sin into the one act when he says "the many were made sinners." Paul, then, understands Adam as both man of myth and history.²⁴ The man of (primeval) history fails a trial, drastically influencing the course of history; the man of myth—the everyman—simply fails, succumbing to the desires of the flesh.²⁵ The circumstances of the many are not Adam's—they are far worse—but their nature is essentially his. "The one man's disobedience" "made (κατεστάθησαν) sinners" of many (v. 19) because through it he forfeited God's intention and became instead the head of a people just like him.²⁶ Thus it makes little difference overall whether we translate 5:12c–d as "and so death spread to all with the result that all have sinned" or "because all have sinned." In the first case, which is perhaps to be preferred, Paul speaks to the fact that Adam's original mortality and corruptibility is inherited by his descendants, and therefore they sin just as he sinned. In the second, he refers to the fact that all sin, just as Adam, and therefore die (cf. Rom 6:23). This confirms the thesis that Paul is not so concerned to offer an explanation for why there is sin at all;

23 Elsewhere, too, we have seen Paul speak of Adam's original condition as standing in continuity with the present condition of humankind, for instance, in 1 Cor 11:7 and 1 Cor 15:45–50.

24 Framing it as an either/or, Muddiman complains that it is impossible to tell if Adam is mythological or historical: "Adam, the Type of the One to Come," *Theology* 87 (1984): 106.

25 For some inchoate thoughts along these lines, cf. A. J. M. Wedderburn, "Adam in Paul's Letter to the Romans," in *Studia Biblica* 1978, 3 (Sheffield: JSOT, 1980), 423. Also his "Theological Structure." There he concludes, "To obliterate the responsibility of the individual or to make him guilty of that for which he was not responsible may be unethical, but it is equally false to deny that *de facto* it is human to sin and to die and that socially and physically we are thus inevitably involved in a situation from which only Christ can release us. This tension or balance between the social or cosmic and the individual must not be destroyed, and it is to the impoverishment of Paul's thought to seek to eliminate it there" (p. 354). In general, the step from Wedderburn's position in these articles to my own consists only in a more leisurely tour through Eden.

26 Very close to Paul's is the pattern of thought in 4 Ezra 3:4–27; 4:30–32, especially 3:21–22: "For the first Adam, burdened with an evil heart, transgressed and was overcome, as were also all who were descended from him. Thus the disease became permanent." Paul is less perplexed about evil than is Ezra because of his assurance of God's plan to deal with sin and death in Christ. For a different estimation of the comparison, cf. Mark Seifrid, "Romans," in *Commentary on the New Testament*, 629. See also Tobin, "Jewish Context."

rather, his thought is more consistent with the portrayal of sin as an inevitable enemy in the existential reality of being human, at least provisionally.²⁷

How Adam becomes the cause of sin and death for his descendants has been a perennial problem for readers of Romans. Potential answers have been many, including appeals to the alien idea of a free-willing forfeiture of supernatural righteousness or glory,²⁸ the boogeyman of Gnostic influence,²⁹ the ghostly concept of "corporate personality,"³⁰ the artificiality of seminal transmission of the guilt of original sin,³¹ and the lameness of Adam's bad example.³² The answer may have been concealed in its simplicity: *Adam passes on his humanity*—and leaves creation open to chaotic powers (only implied in 5:12–21). The trigger was his disobedience; the alternative was immortality. The answer is not unlike that offered in the early centuries of the church, as far as it can be determined, and by the Greek fathers in the fifth century and beyond: Adam passes on corruptibility and mortality.³³ But the persuasiveness of the answer depends on recognizing that Paul sees in Adam what humans typically do (cf. on Rom 7:7–12 below), and that he knows of the alternative Adam

-
- 27 Barrett saw this: "Paul's sentence [vv. 12–14] ... leaves open the question of the origin of sin ... The raw material of it was, in the language of Genesis, already present in Eden: the snake was there, and so was a tree with desirable fruit (Gen. iii. 6). But there could be no 'desire to return to the lost state of bliss and immortality'; that state had, by definition, not yet been lost," and he then proceeds to cite 9:20 and 11:32; *Romans*, 105. Paul shows the same lack of concern to explain the presence of evil in Rom 7:7–12, as argued below.
- 28 For an account and refutation, cf. Fitzmyer, *Romans*, 408–11, but adopting the position that "Paul does not explain how that baneful effect of Adam [i.e., the origin of sin in human life] takes place" (407).
- 29 Rudolf Bultmann, "Adam and Christ according to Romans 5," in *Current Issues in New Testament Interpretation*, ed. W. Klassen and G. F. Snyder (San Francisco: Harper, 1962), 150, 154; Egon Brandenburger, *Adam und Christus: exegetisch-religions-geschichtliche Untersuchung zu Röm. 5,12–21 (1.Kor 15)*, WMANT 7 (Neukirchen: Neukirchener Verlag, 1962), 168–80.
- 30 E.g., F. F. Bruce, *The Letter of Paul the Apostle to the Romans: An Introduction and Commentary*, TNTC (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1985), 119–20.
- 31 Not unique to but classically associated with Augustine; see the following note.
- 32 Pelagius apparently held to Adam's mortality regardless of his obedience or disobedience and affirmed the innate capacity of humankind to obey. Cf. the history of exegesis in David Weaver, "From Paul to Augustine: Romans 5:12 in Early Christian Exegesis," *SVTQ* 27 (1983): 187–206; idem, "The Exegesis of Romans 5:12 among the Greek Fathers and Its Implication for the Doctrine of Original Sin: The 5th–12th Centuries, Pt 2," *SVTQ* 29 (1985): 133–59.
- 33 Thus, he passes on the conditions which make his descendants' corruption inevitable; this is what it means, "the many were made sinners."

failed to achieve. That Paul is aware of destination of the path not chosen by Adam is suggested precisely in the details of his understanding of Christ as his typological counterpart. However, before Paul elaborates on that, another matter preoccupies him, and it confirms the picture of Adam we have discovered thus far.

Adam and Law

That Paul did not mention (the) law in 5:12 can be taken in one of two ways: it might be irrelevant to the subject matter, or it might be assumed but not specified. That the latter is the case becomes evident in vv. 13–14. Indeed, one of the most striking aspects of Paul's argument in Rom 5:12–21 is the manner in which Paul indirectly fashions Adam's sin as an encounter with divine law (vv. 13–14; cf. v. 20). And yet, the proposition is sufficiently counter-intuitive to mean that this aspect of the argument is often overlooked or (implicitly) rejected by scholars.³⁴ The argument here will find additional support from Rom 7:7–12, which puts into an autobiographical narrative the homologous existential encounter with sin that confronts Edenic (i.e., original) and subsequent (i.e., ordinary) humanity that we have seen to stand behind Rom 5:12a–b, c–d, only there making explicit the impact of divine law in such an encounter. In Rom 5:12–14, Paul has in mind an issue of historical *discontinuity* between Adam and his descendants living prior to Moses; those living between Adam and Moses experienced the sin-death nexus apart from a transparent encounter with divine law stipulating death.³⁵

34 Cf., e.g., Seifrid, "Romans," *Commentary on the New Testament*, 632, commenting on Rom 7:7–12: "[Paul] cite[s] the law, which he expressly indicated earlier was not present at the fall but came only through Moses (5:14, 20)." Of course, the *Jewish* law did not precede Moses, according to Paul, but Seifrid undermines a crucial aspect of Paul's argument in both texts (5:13–4 and 7:7–11). Also missing this connection is Macaskill, *Union with Christ*, 237–38, resulting in a different construal also of Rom 7:7–12.

35 How commonplace was the notion of Adam being given divine law? A mere reference to commandment in a context recalling Gen 2–3 might simply reflect the biblical text itself (cf. צוה in Gen 2:16; 3:11, 17) and constitute no particular emphasis on the theme; however, many of the texts below form some link with commandment backwards to creation or forward to the Mosaic covenant: 1 En. 32:6 (ate from the tree of wisdom; notably, no stress at all on command); CD 11–111 (speaks of the violation of their "Creator's precepts," מצריות עשייהם, 11 21, cf. 111 8, on account of the evil heart in primordial times, of Abraham's keeping them and passing them on, eventually to Israel, etc.); 4QpHos^b 7–8 1 ("כי אדם" they broke the covenant"; cf. Hos 6:7); 4Q504 8 *recto* 4–9 (Adam did not keep, שמר, was put under obligation, ותקם עלי, and was not to turn aside, (לבלתי ס[ו]ר); Jub. 2–3 (homology of creation, paradise, and Mosaic law; Adam and Eve break commandment, but the stress is on Adam's priestly activities immediately following expulsion from the garden, after he is clothed); Sir 17:11–12, 14 (law of life, eternal covenant, decrees, and commandment given

Paul states, “Sin was indeed in the world before the law, but sin is not reckoned when there is no law.”³⁶ Yet death exercised dominion from Adam to Moses, even over those whose sins (ἀμαρτήσαντας) were not like the transgression of Adam (ἐπὶ τῷ ὁμοιώματι τῆς παραβάσεως Ἀδάμ), who is a type of the one who was to come” (5:13–14). Here Paul reveals an assumption he makes: Adam encountered God’s law. Two features of the text reveal that Paul imagines an Edenic encounter with law.³⁷ First, Paul reasons in vv. 13–14 so as to imply Adam’s encounter with law:³⁸ in the period before the Mosaic law (vv. 13–14),

to Adam and Eve); Josephus, *A.J.* 1.40–47 (commandment[s]); Philo, *Opif.* 3 (harmony of law, creation, commandment in Moses’ exordium); *Leg.* 1.90–108 (the earthly Adam given commandments); cf. *QG* 1.15; *Plan.* 44–45; Sib. Or. 1:38–45, 51–53 (Adam and Eve given commands); LAB 13:8–9 (Adam given commandment with promise of all things subject to him; implicit comparison with the law of Moses, v. 10); 4 Ezra 3:7, 20–23 (commandment given to Adam, law through Moses, but the same evil heart prevents obedience in both cases); cf. 7:11, 21; 2 Bar. 4:3; 17:1–18:2 (implicit contrast between Adam, including most of his descendants, and Moses in terms of obedience); 2 En. 30:15–31 (Adam given a commandment); Adam and Eve transgress command: LAE 18:1; 26:2; 34:1–3; 37:2; 38:2; 49:1–3; Apoc. Mos. 7:1; 8:2 (Adam forsakes the covenant, διαθήκη); 10:2; 11:1–3; 21:2; 23:3; 24:1, 4; 25:1; 39:1; Apoc. Sed. 4:4; Hel. Syn. Pr. 12:44–46 (Adam given the commandment as trial with the reward of immortality); Hist. Rech. 7:8 (Adam transgressed commandment); Adam given divine law: Tg. Ps.-J. 2:15; 3:9–11, 15, 22–24; Tg. Neof. 2:15; 3:9, 22–24; Frg. Tg. 2:15. Additional Rabbinic texts: Gen. Rab. 8:2; 16:5–6; 24:5; Deut. Rab. 2:25; b. Sanh. 56b; Pirq. R. El. 13; Midr. Pss. 1:10; 6:2; Midr. Prov. 8:4; Pesiq. Rab Kah. 12:1; Maimonides, Mish. Tor. 14.5.9.1. I have adapted, expanded, and annotated the above references which are primarily drawn from Vlachos, *The Law and the Knowledge*, 176 n. 5, and Hermann Lichtenberger, *Das Ich Adams und das Ich der Menschheit: Studien zum Menschenbild in Römer 7*, WUNT 164 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2004), 205–41.

36 In 2:12 Paul spoke of those “who have sinned apart from the law” and asserted that they “will also perish apart from the law.” The statement is parallel to the assertions in v. 13a and b respectively (cf. 3:20). However, Paul chooses not to take up the argument he made there when he asserted that “they show that what the law requires is written on their hearts” (2:15) likely because it is the sentence of death which the law stipulates for disobedience which is the pertinent issue here: why do all die, if not all are confronted by the law stipulating death? Paul’s answer, “sin was indeed in the world,” implies that the law formalizes a consequence that accords with the cosmic order of things: the fruit of sin is death. Cf. Otfried Hofius, “The Adam-Christ Antithesis and the Law: Reflections on Romans 5:12–21,” in *Paul and the Mosaic Law*, ed. J. D. G. Dunn (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 2001), 186. Käsemann: “Under the law judgment is to be expected on the last day. Even before its enactment, however, punishment falls on committed sin according to the nexus of act and consequence described in 1:24ff”; Käsemann, *Romans*, 149–50.

37 Cf. Vlachos, *The Law and the Knowledge*, 114–16.

38 It should be stressed that Adam and Moses are not compared but rather the experience of Adam and of those under the Mosaic law. Therefore we must disagree with Scroggs who

people sinned under circumstances *unlike* Adam's; conversely, it stands to reason, Adam sinned under circumstances *not* unlike those *after* Moses.³⁹ Second, Paul's language for sin, the fact that he calls Adam's disobedience a παράβασις, implies his encounter with law. According to Paul's own definition in Rom 4:15, "transgression" is a violation of a formalized norm, explicit legislation (οὐδὲ οὐκ ἔστιν νόμος οὐδὲ παράβασις).⁴⁰ When he applies the term to Adam's disobedience, Paul must then have in mind the command of Gen 2:16–17, which put Adam in continuity with those under the Mosaic law and discontinuity with those who lived prior to Moses.

Paul could have made the comparison between Adam and Christ entirely without reference to law. Verses 13–14 look parenthetical. And yet the subject of law emerges again in v. 20, suggesting that Adam's encounter with the commandment may be more integral to his thinking than at first glance.⁴¹ In v. 20

argues that "the one who was to come" of whom Adam was a type is Moses; cf. Scroggs, "What Adam truly prefigures is Moses, since both figures were in a Torah relationship with God," *The Last Adam*, 80–81; following John A. T. Robinson, *The Body: A Study in Pauline Theology* (Louisville, KY: Westminster, 1977), 35.

39 Gerd Theissen has formulated it clearly: "If, first, people in the interim period between Adam and Moses did not sin like Adam and if, second, they sinned without law, then the sin of Adam and the sin under the law must be comparable"; *Psychological Aspects of Pauline Theology* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1987); I owe the reference to Vlachos, *The Law and the Knowledge*, 115 n. 132. Cf. also Wright, *Romans*, 10:527.

40 BDAG s.v. supplies, "act of deviating from an established boundary or norm, *overstepping, transgression*." Cf. Rom 2:23; 1 Tim 2:14; Heb 2:2, 9:15; 2 Macc 15:10; Ps 100:3; Wis 14:31; Josephus, *A.J.* 3.218. The notorious crux in Gal 3:19 might stand in some tension with what Paul says in Romans, but it still confirms the close association between *nomos* and *παράβασις*. Jewett (among others) is unconvinced that a distinction can be made between "sin" (however defined) and "transgression" as a breach of a particular command such as Adam had received (Gen 2:16–17). While he admits that the "syntax of v. 14 suggests that 'transgression' and 'sin' are not synonymous," he appeals to Paul's later use of *παράπτωμα* ("trespass") of Adam's and his descendants sin in order to suggest that "the distinctions between these forms of violation remain murky"; Jewett, *Romans*, 378. Some distinctions are clear, however. "Sin" becomes concretized in "sins," "trespasses," and "transgressions." While both "trespasses" and "transgressions" are categories of "sin," Paul, in the light of 4:15, employs the latter of these as a technical term, for breaching specific legislation. Thus Adam's disobedience can be "sin," "trespass," or "transgression," but not all "sins" and not all "trespasses" are, *in this context*, "transgressions." Cf. Hultgren, *Romans*, 225.

41 Jewett's argument that Paul means to refute the exclusive definition of sin as legal violation by undermining the notion of the eternal presence of the law (citing Bar. 4:1; Jub. 2:33; 6:4; Sib. Or. 3:757; m. 'Abot 3:14) falters both on our reading of vv. 13–14 (which Jewett rejects; cf. n. 40) and Paul's use of the verb *παρεισέρχονται* to describe the law "entering in" in v. 20. This choice of verb is ill-suited to disarming that notion. Cf. Jewett, *Romans*, 377.

Paul focuses on the negative impact of the law: “But law came in (*παρεισήλθεν*), with the result that the trespass multiplied.” The context here indicates clearly that Paul is speaking of a time post-Adam. Nevertheless, Paul maintains the homology between Adam’s sin and sin under Torah with the verb *παρεισέρχομαι*, which leaves open the door for some form of pre-existence for law (cf. Gal 2:4); in the manner that he sets law on the world stage (*παρεισέρχομαι*) so as to recall the entrance of sin and death (*εἰσέρχομαι*, v. 12); and by the anarthrous νόμος in v. 20. That Paul does not highlight νόμος or the commandment in v. 12 reflects the emphasis there on the anthropologically induced plight to which the man Christ is the solution. It cannot be said that “through one man law entered into the world,” for Adam was not a law-giver and the law was divine in origin (Rom 3:21, 31; 7:12; 9:4; Gal 3:21).

The presence of law in Eden will become an important plank in the argument of Rom 7:7–12, which will offer more definite insights concerning the role and significance of law in Pauline anthropogony. At the very least, it is apparent at this stage that the presence of law in Eden was insufficient to keep sin and death at bay.⁴²

Adam, the Type

While Paul broke off the grammatical structure initiated in v. 12 in order to address the historical relationship between death, sin, and law, and though the syntactical form initiated there does not reappear until v. 18 (cf., too, v. 19 and 21), Paul nevertheless returns to the comparison which he had originally begun to make in v. 12 with the reference to Adam as the “type of the one who was to come” at the end of v. 14. By verse 15, he is back on track. At the heart of the entire passage (5:12, 15–21) is the thesis that as Adam stands at the head of historical humanity and determines its destiny, Christ stands at the head of eschatological humanity and determines its destiny. Adam initiated a history of sin and death, but Christ initiates a new reign of righteousness and life. Many of the details of the text are in dispute. Our focus here shall be to demonstrate that the development of the typological correspondence is best construed by a reading of the scriptural-mythological context (Gen 1–3) not in terms of a relatively static and perfected ontology pertaining to Adam

For a related argument that does not involve a polemic against the eternal presence of the law, cf. Tobin, “Jewish Context.”

42 The indirectness with which Paul discloses the presence of divine law in Eden in vv. 13–14 resembles other texts where Paul conveys narratively the negative soteriological impact of the law; in Gal 3:19–20, Rom 5:20, and 7:7–12 God is only obliquely associated with these events.

and creation which is associated with the paradigm of fall and restoration, but rather with a dynamic ontology in which Adam is invited to partake in his own and creation's becoming.

Paul says that Adam is the *τύπος τοῦ μέλλοντος* (v. 14). By *τύπος* Paul relates a hermeneutical event of correspondence, which implies divine oversight, anticipating a point he will make in 8:28–30, where God predestines the elect to be conformed to the image of his Son. The word refers to the impression made by striking (*τύπτω*, “to strike”), as in a footprint, seal, or even a scar, and developed the sense of “form,” with nuances of “mark,” “mold,” “outline,” “figure.”⁴³ The designation of Adam as a type of Christ has puzzled interpreters, inasmuch as the correspondence seems largely antithetical—and it is—but the antithesis is premised on a shared identity. Adam and Christ are two apples, or two oranges, but not one of each. Goppelt states, “Christ corresponds antithetically to Adam *and also emulates him*. The *τύπος* here is the advance presentation, but with a suggestion of the hollow form which makes an opposite impression.”⁴⁴ Goppelt highlights the “shadow of what is to come” (*σκιὰ τῶν μελλόντων*) in Col 2:17 as a close parallel but the unusual aspect of contrast which seems to attach to the use of the word in Rom 5:14 is better compared to 1 Cor 10:6: “Now these things occurred as examples (*τύποι*) for us, so that we might not desire evil as they did” (cf. 1 Thess 1:7; 2 Thess 3:9; Phil 3:17; 1 Tim 4:12; 1 Pet 5:3). It is important to bear in mind that *τύπος* is used here in a context in which Paul draws out correspondences in the salvific institutions in Israel's origins and the present time (“the end of the ages,” 10:11). When he says “these things (*ταῦτα*) occurred as *τύποι*” it is possible to hear a similar relation of *anticipation* and *antithesis*, or continuity and discontinuity to that found in Rom 5:14: the experience of the Israelites anticipates that of the Corinthians but the Corinthians are to learn by their negative example and enjoy a better outcome. In other words, the Corinthians are to stand to Israel as Christ stands to Adam. In each case, there is a combination of the *usual* pattern of excess of antitype over type and the *unusual* element of antithesis between anti-typed realities over against their typological counterparts.⁴⁵ But the discovery of a like-pattern does not

43 Cf. Goppelt, *τύπος*, *TDNT*, 8:246–59.

44 Ibid. Emphasis added.

45 In Gal 4:21–31, a passage in which Paul confessedly engages in *ἀλληγοῦν* (4:24), the dialectic between anticipation and antithesis appears in Paul's application of textual realities to extra-textual phenomena: thus, Jerusalem below (textually, Hagar) corresponds to Jerusalem above (textually Sarah), but one is in slavery and the other is free. While the different hermeneutical phenomena complicate the comparison and the ability to illuminate the use of *τύπος* in Rom 5:14, the categories broadly overlap (Adam/Hagar/

explain the precise relationship of anticipation and antithesis, or continuity and discontinuity, between Adam and Christ.

It is not enough to stress the antithetical relationship between Adam and Christ, which is so often repeated in the literature. This hermeneutic is really the only option if one can only conceive of traditional fall-restoration paradigms of the primeval tale, for then one must assume that Paul is not presently interested in what Adam *quo* Adam contributes to understanding Christ, as nothing of Adam's original perfection is intimated in the text. Then Adam becomes a mere foil for Christ, an empty cipher, and the use of *τύπος* becomes obscured almost beyond recognition. However, Paul's language draws out the similarity that grounds the antithesis and makes the use of "type" comprehensible in the following ways. First, Adam and Christ are both *ἄνθρωποι*.⁴⁶ Second, they are both *singular agents*, as Paul repeatedly stresses through different genitival constructions involving the adjective "one" ([*τοῦ*] *ένός*, vv. 12, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19). Third, Paul construes the effect of their agency homologously through the repeated use of the key word *βασιλεύω* on each side of the typological equation: (vv. 14, 17 [twice], 21 [twice]).⁴⁷ In the development of this third point lies the real vitality of the typological relationship.

Paul shows his hermeneutical cards in the construal of the gift that does not merely cancel out the trespass but pushes humanity past that threshold from which Adam strayed.⁴⁸ The fullest statement of this aborted destiny from a cosmic and anthropogonic perspective arrives in chapter eight, but the Adam-Christ typology is its basis, as is confirmed by the way the discussion of that later chapter is foreshadowed in v. 17 of the present chapter: "If, because of the

earthly-Jerusalem, Christ/Sara/heavenly-Jerusalem) and a typological sense comparable in features to the Adam/Christ relationship is conveyed on the level of the external realities allegorically signified. The one Jerusalem corresponds to the other, but the one is in slavery, the other is free; one is on earth (present), the other above (eschatological).

46 This is the word Paul initially chose to refer to Adam in v. 12 (the proper name emerging in v. 14), and it is probably the word that would have referred to Christ had Paul not broken his train of thought there (cf. Rom 1:3; 8:3; 1 Cor 15:21); in any case, it appears of Christ in v. 15 and is implied throughout.

47 He says, on the one hand, that "death exercised dominion from Adam to Moses" (v. 14), that "because of the one man's trespass, death exercised dominion" (v. 17), and that "sin exercised dominion in death" (v. 21); on the other, that recipients of the gift will "exercise dominion in life" (v. 17) and that "grace" is to "exercise dominion through justification leading to eternal life" (v. 21).

48 Similarly, Wright: "Nor was the result a mere restoration of where Adam was before: in Christ, the human project begun in Adam but never completed, has been brought to its intended goal"; *Romans*, 10:524.

one man's trespass, death exercised dominion (ἐβασίλευσεν) through that one, much more surely will those who receive the abundance of grace and the free gift of righteousness exercise dominion (βασιλεύουσιν) in life through the one man, Jesus Christ."⁴⁹ In this verse Paul alludes to the vocation with which God's earthly images are assigned in Gen 1:26 and 28 to "subdue" (κατακυριεύω) the earth and "have dominion" (ἄρχω) over every living thing (cf. Ps 8:7 [E: 6]),⁵⁰ and he understands Adam's sin in the garden as the archetypal turning back from that vocation, resulting in the inversion of the pattern of power Adam was to exercise over creation, that is, resulting in the reign of death, Adam's succumbing to his own corruptibility (alluding to Gen 3:14–19). Paul does not quite complete the parallelism here, but in the following verses the "trespass" is explicitly contrasted with the "act of righteousness" (δικαίωμα, v. 18) and the "disobedience" (παρακοή) of one with the "obedience" (ὑποκοή, v. 19) of the other. Through the completed obedience of Adam's antitype those receiving the gift are assured to reign in life (v. 17). The result of the Christ-event therefore is not only to cancel the trespass but to complete the vocation with which humankind had been charged, the "exercise of dominion in life" (v. 17), that is, in "eternal life" (v. 21).

With this mythological substratum in place, which with the very name "Adam" Paul invites his readers to recollect and with his logic to reconstruct, certain features of Paul's argument are given new clarity. First, as I have been arguing, the typological relationship does not consist merely in antithesis but also in the essential coherence of the world-turning potentiality which confronted each person (vv. 17, 21). In both Adam and Christ, humankind is at the threshold of fulfillment. Adam missteps, but Christ corrects and completes the course. The implicitly pessimistic account Paul gives of Adam's ability to obey is indeed as much a product of Paul's Christ as it is of Genesis' Adam.⁵¹ And yet the Adam of Genesis also contributes to Paul's Christ, for Paul interprets the salvation offered in Christ not merely as cancelling Adam's debt but as fulfilling Adam's hope, as read from Gen 1–3.

Second, the superabundance of the gift, which Paul is at pains to stress, can now be outfitted with a concreteness that often escapes accounts of

49 Similarly, Wright: "Rom 5:12–21 functions as a programmatic statement, awaiting the fuller explanation of Rom 8:12–30." *Ibid.*, 10:512.

50 In 6:9 Paul tells the Romans that "death no longer has dominion (κυριεύει) over [Christ]"; then in v. 12 to "not let sin exercise dominion (βασιλεύετω) in your mortal bodies"; and then in v. 14 that "sin will have no dominion (κυριεύσει) over you." No significance can be attached to the fact that Paul in 5:17 does not reproduce the exact language of Gen 1:26, 28.

51 This is not to say it is pure eisegesis; Gen 1–3 is as polyvalent and open as any narrative.

this text—and this will help to advance one of our major theses. In verse 15, Paul assures the reader that if the “trespass” (παράπτωμα) brought death to the many, the “free gift” (χάρισμα) has certainly (πολλῷ μᾶλλον) “abounded” (ἐπερίσσευσεν) to the many. The choice of the verb περιρσεύω indicates the excess of the “free gift”; it comes with an abundance. So how is this excess manifest? Is Paul simply speaking abstractly about God’s mercy exceeding his judgement (cf. Exod 34:6), or is something more specific in mind? With the trespass, Paul proceeds to point out its effect, “death.” Does he also have the effect “of the grace of God and the free gift in mind” in speaking of its excess, namely, that which actually constitutes the gift?⁵² Verse 16 moves toward that very matter: “And the free gift (δωρημα) is not like the effect of the one man’s sin (δι’ ἐνὸς ἁμαρτήσαντος). For the judgment (κρίμα) following one trespass brought condemnation (εἰς κατάκριμα), but the free gift (χάρισμα) following many trespasses (παραπτωμάτων) εἰς δικαίωμα.” Now Paul stresses the effect as “justification” or perhaps “righteous decree.”⁵³ If Adam starts out from a

52 Jewett asks to what the “much more” refers, and highlights three positions which have been taken, namely, the quantity of blessings, the intensity of blessings, or their certainty. He opts for the first, which appears to cohere with the suggestion being pursued here, that Paul has in mind the manner that the free gift more than cancels out the effect of the trespass. Cf. Jewett, *Romans*, 381 n. 137. Keck explains the “utter disparity between ‘the trespass’ and ‘the begracement’” as founded on “an unstated contrast: Death happened *to* the ‘many’ as a consequence of their own trespasses (v. 12), but what occurred *for* the many was *not* a consequence of what they did but solely the result of God’s grace actualized in Christ’s grace . . . Over against the deserved consequence of Adam stands the underserved consequence of God’s gift. The ‘trespass’ is indeed not like ‘the begracement’”; Keck, *Romans*, 152. While the contrast between what is deserved and what is not importantly speaks to the difference between the trespass and the gift, it does not easily account for the sense of excess, the lesser-to-greater that Paul stresses. Barclay, too, seems to press beyond the distinction between what is given with regard to worth (condemnation) and what is not (the gift) toward the *effect* or *content* of the gift: “The relentless momentum of sin . . . is here not just stopped in its tracks, but reversed by the establishment of a counter-momentum leading out of sin into life (5:17). This re-creative dynamic is again the hallmark of χάρις (cf. 4:17), creating life out of its opposite, death (5:21)”; *Paul and the Gift*, 494–500 (here 496).

53 Commentators regularly explain the appearance of δικαίωμα here as due to “rhetorical assimilation,” as Käsemann put it: *Romans*, 154; cited and followed by Hultgren, *Romans*, 227. Thus it is usually taken as synonymous to δικαίωσις, “justification,” “vindication,” or “acquittal,” in preference to its normal meaning as either (1) “regulation,” “requirement,” “commandment,” “decree” (cf. Luke 1:6; Rom 1:32; 2:26; 8:4; Heb 9:1, 10; Rev 15:4) or (2) “righteous deed” (cf. 5:18; Rev 19:8). Cf. BDAG s.v.; G. Schrenck, *TDNT* 2:219–21. However, Jewett’s argument in favour of “righteous decree” should be seriously considered: “Condemnation

supernatural condition (such as participating in the righteousness or glory of God), the gift might be sufficient to effect salvation, but then Paul's language of the *excess* of the gift risks being reduced to an empty platitude. It would not be clear how "the free gift given by God in Christ more than matches the sin of Adam and its effects" but rather "exceeds it."⁵⁴ If, on the other hand, Adam begins from a position of mere innocence and incompleteness, the excess of the gift might consist in the manner that it not only assures acquittal (a return to innocence) but also the whole of salvation (the completion of Adam's commission).⁵⁵ Verse 17 again proves to be key: "If, because of the one man's trespass, death exercised dominion (ἐβασίλευσεν) through that one, much more surely will those who receive the abundance of grace (τὴν περισσεΐαν τῆς χάριτος) and the free gift of righteousness (τῆς δωρεᾶς τῆς δικαιοσύνης) exercise dominion in life (ἐν ζωῇ βασιλεύσουσιν) through the one man, Jesus Christ." This verse draws together some of the key terms used in vv. 15 and 16, the most significant of which for determining the excess of the grace-gift is in the association of the abundance of grace, the gift of righteousness, and the reign of the saints. Here it is transparent: the surplus of the gift consists in not simply cancelling Adam's transgression—effecting a return to innocence—but in inaugurating the *telos* which Adam's disobedience forestalled.⁵⁶ Notably, this sense of surplus is depleted if Adam is originally conceived as a signet of perfection, a receptacle of glory. Instead, Adam's incompleteness and liminality is assumed.⁵⁷ Romans 7:7–12 will confirm this.

Finally, this protological context contributes clarity to the synthesis of forensic and participatory categories in Paul's thought. It is extremely difficult to disentangle these discourses in Rom 5:12–21, as a quick listing of some of the terminology conveys.⁵⁸ Paul speaks of "the gift of righteousness" that

is therefore juxtaposed with God's righteous decree of salvation in Christ" (citing Rom 8:2; cf. also Rom 1:16–17; 3:25); *Romans*, 382.

54 Hultgren, *Romans*, 227. He does not explain how this is so.

55 Cf. n. 58 on Rom 5:9–10.

56 This interpretation of the excess of the gift relieves some of the pressure to read the passage in a universalist sense; note how the lack of content supplied to the idea supports Hultgren's recent defense of a universalist interpretation: *Ibid.*, 229–34.

57 Compare Ricoeur: the "how much more" "excludes the possibility that the 'gift' should be a simple restoration of the order that prevailed before the 'fault'; the gift is the establishment of a new creation"; Ricoeur, *The Symbolism of Evil*, 272. Also, Wright, *Romans*, 10:528. Käsemann is less helpful: "in the apocalyptic horizon the end-time is infinitely superior to fall-determined primal time"; *Romans*, 152.

58 In Rom 5:9–10, where the language of excess was first introduced, Paul more neatly separated the forensic, specified as justification and reinterpreted as reconciliation (=a return

somehow issues in “exercising dominion in life” (v. 17), of the act of obedience actually “making the many righteous” (v. 18), of grace’s “exercise [of] dominion through justification leading to eternal life” (v. 21), and even of the effect of Christ’s “act of righteousness” as leading to δικαίωσιν ζωῆς (v. 18). It is difficult to account for such expressions strictly in forensic categories; they are rather expressions of the *excess* of the gift, as we just saw: if one has one (justification), one has, or will have, the other (full eschatological life). For the same reason it is a distortion to neglect the forensic category: precisely the forensic category construed in relationship to Adam’s innocence makes possible the language of excess. Again, the anthropogonic traditions on which Paul draws offer illumination. The categories of participation and law inhere in Gen 2–3 itself, where they share the uneasy relationship that is also reflected in Paul’s discourse. The forensic category is indicated in Adam’s confrontation with the commandment, whose infraction bears the penalty of death (Gen 2:16–17). At the same time, participatory categories operate in Genesis, adding tension and ambiguity to the narrative: Adam’s mortality is comprehended by way of his membership in the natural plane of existence, his status as an earthling (Gen 2:7; 3:19), and the prospect of eternal life stands under the sign of participation in the tree of life (Gen 3:22). The mixing of these two categories should be seen within the broader character of the biblical traditions, where one finds an uneasy relationship between a mythological worldview and the introduction of historicizing and rationalizing elements, as anthropologists and scholars of religion have long pointed out.⁵⁹

to Adam’s innocence), and the much more of salvation: “*Much more surely* then, now that we have been justified by his blood [=cleared of guilt, Rom 3:21–26], *will we be saved* through him from the wrath of God. For if while we were enemies, we were reconciled to God through the death of his Son, *much more surely*, having been reconciled, *will we be saved* by his life.” Paul’s logic is that if God worked to reconcile *sinners*, surely God will take those former sinners and *complete* their salvation. If he acted graciously to them in their sinful state, then surely he will continue to do the same in their reconciled state. God does not bring them half way. Nor does God bring them back to the start (to Eden) and say, “Now, let’s go over this again. There are two trees . . .” This is the abundance of the gift and it speaks to Adam’s originally liminal condition.

- 59 Stanley Tambiah characterizes these competing rationalities as “causality” and “participation”: *Magic, Science, Religion, and the Scope of Rationality*, Lewis Henry Morgan Lectures (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990), 109. On the biblical tradition *per se*, cf., e.g., *ibid.*, 1–41; Peter L. Berger, *The Sacred Canopy: Elements of a Sociological Theory of Religion* (Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1969), 113–20; Max Weber, *Ancient Judaism* (Glencoe, IL: Free Press, 1952). In fact the tension between these two kinds of rationality is in different degrees a universal phenomenon. Cf. Tambiah, *Magic, Science, Religion*, 90.

It is no surprise, then, that when Paul speaks of humankind's condemnation he draws in large measure on the rationalizing and forensic tendencies of biblical tradition (especially, legal and sapiential discourses, as in Rom 1–4) and when he speaks of its salvation he draws on the participatory (chs. 5–8, with affinities to prophetic, apocalyptic, and even myth and mysticism), but without abandoning the forensic (as here, 5:12–21; 6:7; 8:3–4), for that is part of the context in which humankind's dilemma has been spelled out from the beginning (Gen 2:16–17; Rom 5:12–14; 7:7–12). If there is tension between these categories in his thought,⁶⁰ that must be set within the context of the heavily hybridized tradition to which he is committed.⁶¹

60 The precise nature of the relationship is difficult to tease out. It would be possible to view the rationalizing as representing a secondary evaluation in a highly structured and logical discourse of an antecedent reality which basically retains all the characteristics associated with the mythological worldview. This falters, however, in that there can be little doubt that the rationalizing tradition has also acted on the mythological and modified it. So with Paul interpreters have puzzled over the relationship. While the forensic discourse comes into prominence particularly in the wake of controversies centered on the circumcision of Paul's Gentile converts (cf. Westerholm, *Perspectives*, 352–407, 440–45), the temporal relationship between the forensic and participatory categories may not match the logical relationship. For some preliminary exploration, cf. Stephen J. Chester, *Conversion at Corinth: Perspectives on Conversion in Paul's Theology and the Corinthian Church*, SNTW (London: T & T Clark, 2005), 329–36 (“It is a mistake to force a choice between the forensic and participatory elements in Paul's theology so that only one or the other can be regarded as truly characteristic of his thought,” p. 336); Timo Laato, “Paul's Anthropological Considerations: Two Problems,” in *Justification and Variegated Nomism Volume 2, The Paradoxes of Paul*, ed. Donald A. Carson, Peter Thomas O'Brien, and Mark A. Seifrid, trans. Sigurd Grindheim (Grand Rapids: Baker, 2004), 348–49 (“Paul has in mind no [theological] distinction between the juridical and participatory categories”); Timo Eskola, *Theodicy and Predestination in Pauline Soteriology*, WUNT 2/100 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1998), 304–5 (“the participatory theme is actually based on the juridical aspect. . . . Participation in Christ is possible only through justification by faith”). The discussion often takes its starting point from Sanders, who followed in the steps of Schweitzer, and today is dominated by the contribution of Campbell, all of whom argue strongly for the predominance of the category of participation: Sanders, *Paul and Palestinian Judaism*, 472, 501–11, 544–45; Albert Schweitzer, *The Mysticism of Paul the Apostle*, trans. William Montgomery (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1998), 205–26; Douglas A. Campbell, *The Deliverance of God: An Apocalyptic Rereading of Justification in Paul* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2009).

61 Contrast Campbell's method, which is to work these two streams in Paul's thought into total systems which must be dichotomized under the pressure of “sheer rationality.” Cf. Campbell, *Deliverance*, 12.

Thus, the assumption throughout Rom 5:12–21 is that Adam quo Adam (not merely some fallen version of him) speaks to the nature of humankind, as the mythological prototype of humanity. At the same time, there is here an even more pronounced historicizing element, whereby Adam's encounter with divine law spells out the (temporary) abandonment of human fulfillment and the inverse reign of sin and death in the cosmos. The excess of the gift of grace coherently relates not to an original supernatural condition of Adam's but to the transcendence of his original innocence and incompleteness through the gift. It seems that the participation of humankind in Christ's death and resurrection, analogously to participation in Adam, is the presupposition which allows Christ's act of righteousness not merely to cancel the effect of the transgression but extravagantly to make many righteous and effect the fulfillment of human destiny in eternal life and dominion over a creation made new. The category of participation begins to bubble up and spill over the forensic framing of the human dilemma and solution found in Rom 1–4.⁶²

The *Adamic* "I" and its Encounter with Divine Law: Romans 7:7–12

In Rom 7:9–10 Paul narrates elements ostensibly from his own experience in a manner that is patterned on the Edenic encounter with divine law; this allows him to characterize the "I" as that of *adam*, everyman.⁶³ His purpose is equally to vindicate the law and yet expose how it is commandeered by sin. Paul's anthropological presuppositions allow him to entertain such a paradox, for, as he says in Rom 8:3, "the law" is "weakened by the flesh." There are two rhetorical constraints on the *adamic* character of Paul's "I" that are critical to

62 Chapter six, then, with its explicit emphasis on identification through baptism in the death and resurrection of Christ, can be seen not merely as the spelling out of the implications of an essentially forensic event (i.e., sanctification following from justification; e.g., Cranfield, *Romans*, 1:295–96) but as the elaboration of the spiritual-mythic reality that undergirds justification in Christ, but with an emphasis on the present experience and actualization of the superabundant gift. For an elaboration along these lines: "Justified by Faith/Crucified with Christ" in Gorman, *Inhabiting the Cruciform God*, 40–104.

63 There are elements of the narrative that recall the experience of Eve rather than Adam, so I have tried to follow Vlachos in speaking of the "Edenic" setting of Rom 7:7–12; at the same time, it is difficult and probably not helpful to entirely avoid reference to Adam. Sometimes I will use the phrase "*adamic* 'I,'" which effectively alludes to Eden in the prototypical aspect of the events narrated there. On traditions concerning Eve in the garden and an analysis of her role in Rom 7, cf. Austin Busch, "The Figure of Eve in Romans 7:5–25," *BibInt* 12 (2004): 1–36. I briefly interact with Busch below.

an accurate estimation of the Edenic references: Paul presents the narrative as *his own* paradigmatic experience, and Paul is concerned to address the matter of the Torah's relationship to sin. These caveats mean that Paul does not narrate events in Eden *per se*, but that the events in Eden function prototypically in the case of the present narrative. This text exposes the complete absence of any concept of an original supernatural condition in Paul's thought and reveals instead that Paul's thinking with respect to original humankind adopts the relational and developmental categories of innocence and immaturity.

This text has a long history of competing interpretations, and it would be impossible within the confines of this study to do such a history, even in the modern period, any justice.⁶⁴ In addition to the question of *adamic* reference in Rom 7:7–12/13,⁶⁵ the major interpretive questions have surrounded whether Paul has the experience of Israel, Gentile god-fearers, or Eve in mind;⁶⁶

64 Lichtenberger offers nearly 100 pages of *der Geschichte der Forschung in Das Ich Adams*, 13–105; cf. also Mark Reasoner, *Romans in Full Circle: A History of Interpretation* (Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 2005), 67–84. With a more exclusive focus on modern scholarship: Douglas J. Moo, *The Epistle to the Romans*, N1CNT (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1996), 424–31; Jan Lambrecht, *The Wretched "I" and Its Liberation: Paul in Romans 7 and 8* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1992), 59–72; Hultgren, *Romans*, 681–91.

65 Among recent champions of the *adamic* reference are Lichtenberger, *Das Ich Adams*; Vlachos, *The Law and the Knowledge*, 98–107; Richard N. Longenecker, *Paul, Apostle of Liberty* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1964), 86–97, 109–16; and Stanislas Lyonnet, “‘Tu ne convoiteras pas’ (Rom 7:7),” in *Neotestamentica et Patristica: eine Freundesgabe, Oscar Cullmann zu seinem 60 Geburtstag*, ed. Willem Cornelis van Unnik (Leiden: Brill, 1962), 157–65; idem, “L’histoire du salut selon le chapitre 7 de l’Épître aux Romains,” *Bib* 43 (1962): 117–51. In fact, most scholars have reckoned with some influence of the Adamic narratives on these verses; Vlachos, *The Law and the Knowledge*, provides an eight-page bibliography of such works on pp. 123–30. To be sure, there have been many detractors: Emma Wasserman, *The Death of the Soul in Romans 7: Sin, Death, and the Law in Light of Hellenistic Moral Psychology*, WUNT 256 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008), 103–4; Jewett, *Romans*, 442; A. Andrew Das, *Solving the Romans Debate* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2007), 214–19; Robert H. Gundry, “The Moral Frustration of Paul before His Conversion: Sexual Lust in Romans 7:7–25,” in *The Old Is Better: New Testament Essays in Support of Traditional Interpretations*, WUNT 178 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2005), 254–59; Philip Francis Esler, *Conflict and Identity in Romans: The Social Setting of Paul's Letter* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2003), 234–37; Stanley Kent Stowers, *A Rereading of Romans: Justice, Jews, and Gentiles* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1994), 235; Moo, *Romans*, 424–31 (highly skeptical); while not polemicizing against the position, Hultgren makes little to no positive use of Adamic echoes: Hultgren, *Romans*, 274–80, 681–91.

66 For Israel: Francis Watson, *Paul and the Hermeneutics of Faith* (London: T & T Clark, 2004), 374–80 (Paul speaks as an Israelite); Moo, *Romans*, 424–31; Wright, *Romans*, 10:552–53, 568. For Gentiles: Wasserman, *Death of the Soul*; eadem, “The Death of the Soul in Romans 7: Revisiting Paul's Anthropology in Light of Hellenistic Moral Psychology,” *JBL* 126 (2007):

whether he speaks in a recognizably rhetorical, non-autobiographical form, e.g., gnominically or with *prosopopoeia*, or at least partially autobiographically;⁶⁷ whether a choice must be made between competing identifications—Adam, Eve, Israel, Gentiles, Paul himself, Anyone—or whether some sort of “composite ‘I’” is preferable;⁶⁸ whether he speaks of experience within or outside of Christ;⁶⁹ and how the “I” of vv. 7–13 which is narrated in the past tense is related to the “I” of vv. 14–25 which is narrated in the present (with the exception of v. 24).⁷⁰ If Paul’s “I” adopts an Edenic context, light is shed on many of

814–16; Das, *Solving the Romans Debate*, 223ff.; Stowers, *A Rereading of Romans*, 269–72. For Eve: Busch, “The Figure of Eve.”

- 67 Arguing for a highly stylized rhetorical form that excludes autobiographical reference, a “fictive ‘I’”: Werner Georg Kümmel, *Römer 7 und das Bild des Menschen im Neuen Testament* (Zürich: Zwingli-Verlag, 1948); Krister Stendahl, “The Apostle Paul and the Introspective Conscience of the West,” in *Paul Among the Jews and Gentiles* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1976), 78–96, and generally those arguing for the Gentile identity of the speaker. Many, however, point out that the rhetorical dimension, usually identified as *prosopopoeia*, does not exclude personal reference: Valérie Nicolet-Anderson, “Tools for a Kierkegaardian Reading of Paul: Can Kierkegaard Help Us Understand the Role of the Law in Romans 7:7–12?” in *Reading Romans with Contemporary Philosophers and Theologians*, ed. D. Odell-Scott (New York: T & T Clark, 2007), 247–76; Jewett, *Romans*, 440–45. For autobiographical reference: Hultgren, *Romans*, 685–88; Jewett, *Romans*, 441–45; Watson, *Hermeneutics*, 474–80; Lambrecht, *The Wretched “I,”* 51–92; D. H. Campbell, “The Identity of ἐγώ in Romans 7:7–25,” in *Studia Biblica 111* (Sheffield: JSOT, 1980), 57–64.
- 68 “Adam” is regularly combined with other identities, such as Paul’s or Israel’s, and some have seen a multiplicity of identities; e.g., Brian Dodd, *Paul’s Paradigmatic “I”: Personal Example as Literary Strategy*, JSNTSup 177 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1999), 221–34; Adam, Paul, Jews, perhaps Christians.
- 69 For the former: Barrett, *Romans*, 130–44; Dunn, *Romans*, 1:377, 388, 398–99 (reflecting eschatological tension); Cranfield, *Romans*, 1:341–47 (7:7–13, the Jewish people, with Adam in mind; vv. 14–25, the heightened conscience of the true Christian); Timo Laato, *Paul and Judaism: An Anthropological Approach* (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1995), 123–29 (though 7:7–13 are strictly Adam and Eve). For the latter, Maston, *Agency*, 127–52; Watson, *Hermeneutics*, 374–80; Fitzmyer, *Romans*, 463; Wright, *Romans*, 10:561–64; Longenecker, *Paul, Apostle of Liberty*; Kümmel, *Man in the New Testament*, 49–61; idem, *Das Bild*, 86–97, 109–16.
- 70 Cf. n. 69. Lichtenberger views the “I” of 7:7–13 as Adam’s above all, but in a universalizing aspect, and the “I” of vv. 14–25 as more individual and reflective of personal experience; *Das Ich Adams*, 136. Watson argues 7:7–12 narrate the past event of the initial encounter with the law, and vv. 13–25 apply to the present but with “a crucial fictive element . . . : present reality is described as if it were still under the dominion of the law—which, according to Romans 7.1–6, it is not”; Watson, *Hermeneutics*, 379. On the verbs for knowing and the difference in tenses in 7b, c, cf. Barrett, *Romans*, 132–33.

these disputes. Given the present state of contention, we will devote considerable time to establishing and defining the relationship between Paul's "I" and the events of Eden.

The question of *adamic* reference is most pertinent of vv. 7–12. If the events of Eden can be identified there, it will also have a bearing on the interpretation of vv. 14–25, but we will only be able to suggest how that might look.⁷¹ The text reads:

⁷ What then should we say? That the law is sin? By no means! Yet, if it had not been for the law, I would not have known sin. I would not have known what it is to covet if the law had not said, 'You shall not covet' (οὐκ ἐπιθυμήσεις). ⁸ But sin, seizing an opportunity in the commandment, produced in me all kinds of covetousness. Apart from the law sin lies dead. ⁹ I was once alive apart from the law, but when the commandment came, sin revived (ἀνέζησεν) ¹⁰ and I died, and the very commandment that promised life proved to be death to me. ¹¹ For sin, seizing an opportunity in the commandment, deceived (ἐξηπάτησέν) me and through it killed me. ¹² So the law is holy, and the commandment is holy and just and good. ¹³ Did what is good, then, bring death to me? By no means! It was sin, working death in me through what is good, in order that sin might be shown to be sin, and through the commandment might become sinful beyond measure.

Within Paul's stated desire to defend the sanctity of the law, and yet to expose its role in revealing and enticing dormant sin leading to death (vv. 7–8, 12–13), he constructs a narrative vignette employing the first person pronoun, ἐγώ, suggestive of the progression from childhood innocence to the coming of age (cf. Paul's use of the coming-of-age topos also in 1 Cor 13:11).⁷² This progression in itself assists to recall the events of Eden. The coming of age topos is nicely

71 Verse 13 has been connected alternately by scholars to what precedes or proceeds. The past tense connects it with vv. 7–12, but it also seems to anticipate vv. 14–21, where sin is made sinful beyond measure, i.e., the complete enslavement to sin which is the outcome of the events in vv. 7–12.

72 Käsemann objects that "the idea of childish innocence . . . is completely unbiblical and part of our modern mythology"; *Romans*, 193. Philo shows that it is not so modern and the question is not whether it is "biblical" (yet do not the echoes of it in Gen 2–3 qualify?) but whether it is plausibly employed here. In fact, however, the idea is reflected in numerous places; e.g., Deut 1:39; Ps 8:2; Matt 18:6; 1 Cor 14:20; Phil 2:15; cf. Reidar Aasgaard, "Paul as a Child: Children and Childhood in the Letters of the Apostle," *JBL* 126 (2007): 129–59, on innocence, p. 149. Unfortunately, Rom 7:7–12 is not considered.

illustrated and expanded on by Philo in *Who is the Heir of all Things*, 293–299. He embarks on the discussion as an explanation of Gen 15:6, which notes of Abram's offspring, "in the fourth generation they shall come back hither." The generations correspond to stages in the development of the soul. Infancy to seven years is followed by tumultuous passions (πάθος) of "youth" (citing Gen 7:21), which extends into puberty, then the soul is tended upon by the healing art of philosophy, and finally it grows strong in the virtues. He summarizes:

The first number is that under which it is impossible to form any conception of good or ill (οὔτε ἀγαθὸν οὔτε κακὸν) and the soul receives no impressions. Under the second we experience the onrush of sin. The third is that in which we receive the healing treatment, when we cast off the elements of sickness and the crisis of passion is reached and passed. The fourth is that in which we make good our claim to complete health and strength, when we feel that we are turning back from wickedness and laying our hands to the good. (*Her.* 299)

The differences in anthropology are palpable, but the topos is the same as Paul's, and the sequence overlaps: a period of innocence, the awakening of desire, the entrance of instruction, and the outcome. Paul collapses the second and third stage (passion-instruction) which enables him to highlight the Torah's generative role in bringing sin to life in fleshly humanity, instead of supplying the healing boon of instruction to an already conflicted youthfulness. Below we shall encounter Philo's application of the period of youth and the arrival of instruction to Adam and Eve in the garden. The overlap between the coming of age topos and the Edenic narrative is facilitated by the presence of such motifs within Gen 2–3 itself, especially in the progression from sexual innocence to angst, precipitated by the encounter with the serpent and the partaking of the tree of knowledge of good and evil.⁷³

Three sorts of argument serve to establish the plausibility of the Edenic reference in Rom 7:7–12. First I will discuss precedent, then the connection to Rom 5:12–21, and finally indications within Rom 7:7–12 itself, specifically within the narrative sequence of vv. 9–10, filled out by the commentary in vv. 8 and 11.

Many Greco-Roman parallels to Paul's use of the first person have been brought to bear on the passage, both in terms of its rhetorical form, i.e., related

73 Cf. Philo, *Leg.* 2:53–64, on nakedness as innocence in the case of Adam and Eve. Runia points to the former text, but he does not think the motif applies in the specific instance of *Opif.* 156 and 170; cf. David T. Runia, *On the Creation of the Cosmos according to Moses*, PACS (Leiden: Brill, 2001), 370. On *Leg.* 1:90–96, cf. below.

usually to *prosopopoeia*, and the use of the topos of a lack of self-mastery.⁷⁴ But little to no precedent has been found for the depiction of internal conflict within an “*adamic* ‘I,’” as Jewett complains.⁷⁵ The theoretical basis for such can be seen in 1QS III 17–19 or 2 Bar. 54:19 (“each of us has become our own Adam”), but the actual use of the first person to adopt a consciously *adamic* persona, recalling the events of Eden, has not been identified, so far as I know. The Hodayot supply just this. Scholars have noted the relevance of the Qumran material for the interpretation of Rom 7:7–25 in the past. Early on, Karl G. Kuhn claimed that the “I” spoken by the Qumranites in 1QH^a XI 24–25 and 1QS XI 7–10 was identical to Paul’s, both being spoken from the perspective of salvation and contrasting flesh and spirit; Herbert Braun more carefully identified commonalities and distinctions between the two “I’s,” both in relation to the law (only in Paul was it commandeered by sin) and to the position from which they spoke (only did the Qumran “I” speak explicitly from the perspective of salvation).⁷⁶ Lichtenberger, after discussing Kuhn and Braun, concluded that the Qumran texts indeed supply a close parallel in the use of “I” and anthropological terminology, but differ radically in terms of how the predicament of lostness is overcome.⁷⁷ Despite these insights, the manner in which the “I” of the Qumran texts sometimes adopts an Adam-persona was not stressed.⁷⁸ This phenomenon is most clear in 1QH^a XX 27–31:

[27] As for me (אני), from dust [you] took [me and from clay] I was [n]ipped ²⁸ as a source of pollution and shameful dishonour, a heap of dust and a thing kneaded [with water, a council of magg]ots, a dwelling of ²⁹ darkness. And there is a return to dust for the creature of clay at the

74 E.g., for the former: Euripides, *Med.* 1077–1080; Epictetus, *Diatr.* 1.10.7–9; and for the latter: Euripides, *Hipp.* 377–383; Epictetus, *Diatr.* 2.26.1. Cf. scholars arguing for a Gentile identification in n. 66.

75 *Romans*, 442 n. 23. Jewett highlights plausible events within Paul’s own life in order to explain how the law takes on a negative character in retrospect, and he highlights comparable uses of the first person to argue that autobiographical reference is not excluded by the rhetorical form Paul uses. However, he ties the interpretation of the narrative too closely to events Paul does not narrate and which tend to conflict with the gnomic quality of the language. He also makes an historically questionable application of the *bar mitzvah* ceremony to Paul’s narrative.

76 Cf. Kuhn, “New Light”; Braun, “Selbstverständnis.”

77 Lichtenberger, *Das Ich Adams*, 173–76.

78 The same applies to Fitzmyer, *Romans*, 465–66. Wisdom of Solomon 7:1–6 is comparable, but it retains a distance between the “I” and Adam that is one step removed from Rom 7:9–10. “I” in Wisdom speaks only as Adam’s descendant.

time of [your] anger []dust returns ³⁰ to that from which it was taken. What can dust and ashes reply [concerning your judgement? And ho]w can it understand ³¹ its [d]eeds?

Here the psalmist speaks in the first person while clearly adopting an *adamic* persona, recalling events in Eden, and lamenting human sinfulness.⁷⁹ The text therefore lends considerable plausibility to the suggestion that Paul's "I" does a similar thing in Rom 7:9–11, only in the form of a more sustained first person narrative. Moreover, the question "how can it understand its deeds?" (1QH^a xx 30–31) recalls the situation of disillusionment with the self portrayed in the second part of Paul's exposition, Rom 7:14–25, and it is elaborately narrated elsewhere in the Hodayot.⁸⁰ Strikingly, both Paul and Qumran employ the mirror image of Adam(-Eve) because they want to point to something about Adam's creatureliness that confirms the pessimistic outlook each has concerning the human condition.

The thematic connection between Rom 7:7–12 and chapter 5:12–21 lends support and broad contextual probability to the appearance of Adam's narrative here under the cloak of Paul's paradigmatic "I." Like 5:12–21, the present chapter addresses the connection between "sin," "death," and "law," and the law's role in exposing and expanding sin.⁸¹ And just as 5:12–21 describes the terrible reign of sin in broad historical terms, 7:7–25 does so in an intensely personal narrative. Moreover, just as 5:12 conceives of a moment before sin, a threshold, so 7:9 begins in the twilight of innocence. We saw that Paul in fact speaks of transgression of the law on the model of Adam's transgression in 5:12 and 14, and not without warrant in the scriptural text and subsequent tradition. It is perfectly coherent with Paul's presuppositions, therefore, to expose

79 Cf. the section "The Man of Dust" in Chapter 2.

80 The theme is more elaborately developed in a fashion that anticipates Paul's in the immediately preceding column, 1QH^a XIX 22–25: "As for me (וְאִנִּי), a fount of bitter mourning was opened to me { } and trouble was not hidden from my eyes ²³ when I knew the inclinations of humans (צָרִי גֹבֵר), and I un[derstood] to what mortals return, [and I recognized the mour]nfulness of sin, and the anguish of ²⁴ guilt. They entered my heart and they penetrated my bones ל []ַיָּמ and to utter an agonized moan ^{25a} and a groan to the lyre of lamentation for all gr[iev]ous mourning[] ²⁵ and bitter lament until the destruction of iniquity, when there is n[o more pain] and no more affliction to make one weak." Again echoes of Gen 2–3 are apparent (though less clearly dramatized so that "I" retains greater distinction from Adam's), but now the depressing inevitability of sinful *acts* is stressed.

81 His statements that he would not have known sin apart from the law (v. 7) and that sin through the law becomes sinful beyond measure (v. 13) compare to 5:13 and 20 respectively.

the law as a negative existential factor in the history of salvation in a manner that capitalizes on the universalizing self of an *adamic* “I.”⁸²

There are three points to confirm that the full narrative sequence implied by vv. 8–11 re-lives in the form of Paul’s “I” the events of Eden. The first is in the use of the verb ἀναζῶω to describe the coming to life (again) of sin (v. 9). To many interpreters who subscribe to the *adamic* identification of the “I” this detail recalls the manner in which sin seems to lurk behind the scenes in Eden, both in the persona of the snake but also in the ease with which desire wells up in Eve.⁸³ Criticism is directed towards this proposal from different

82 I am puzzled by Schnelle’s statement that “Paul thus ends up saying something he does not really intend: God’s first covenant was not able to restrain the spreading power of sin and death”; Udo Schnelle, *Apostle Paul: His Life and Theology*, trans. M. Eugene Boring (Grand Rapids: Baker, 2005), 501. The point seems to be made with a clarity and emphasis that is not accidental.

83 It would be possible to argue that the coming to life again of sin in Paul’s narrative refers to the infinitely repeated experience of all who first embark on life under the Torah, perhaps modeled on Israel’s first encounter with the commandment rather than Adam’s. While there is reason to think that the narratives of sin and death surrounding Israel’s reception of the law here indirectly inform Paul’s first person narrative and likewise his reading of Gen 2–3 (Wright cites b. Sanh 38b; 102a; Exod. Rab. 21:1; 30:7; 32:1, 7, 11), it is highly improbable that Israel is to the fore in the persona projected by the “I.” The reference to the commandment and the prior discussion of the law (vv. 1–6) are not sufficient cues to identify the “I” as that of a nation. The “I” is more readily identified as a typical *individual* and the experiences of inner turmoil attributed to it are far more readily attributed to an individual self. Moreover, if Israel is in view, the deadness of sin prior to the law (v. 8) and the contrast between the living and dead self (vv. 9–10) becomes hard to reconcile with Rom 5:13–14, which affirms that unaccounted sin was in the world and death continued to reign prior to Moses. Cf. Wilckens, *Der Brief an Die Römer*, 82. Wright’s explanation is possible but strained: “He seems to indicate some kind of potential life for sin beyond simply producing death; when individuals sin and die, sin is not growing, not flourishing in new ways. When, however, the law appears, then sin gains, as we might say, a new lease of life”; Wright, *Romans*, 10:563. Esler simply equates “not taken into account” (5:13) with “inactive” (7:7); *Conflict and Identity*, 235. Watson’s version of the “I” as “Israelite” is more tenable: with the “I” Paul speaks of himself as an “Israelite,” using “representative biography”; Watson, *Hermeneutics*, 379. He thus is able to see the progression from innocence and the deadness of sin, to sinfulness and death as modeled on the coming of age topos. One needs to add the qualification that the Edenic echoes, the choice of a commandment that represents a broad ideal, and the broad anthropological basis of the whole discussion (7:7–25; cf., with some overstatement, Käsemann, *Romans*, 199) lend a universality to Paul’s “I” so that its relevance and representative significance is not meant to characterize an Israelite *in distinction* from the non-Israelite. In speaking as an Israelite, or better, a Jew (for the narratives of Israel’s reception of the law are at best faintly echoed), Paul

directions. First, it is supposed to contradict Rom 5:12 (“sin came into the world through one man”), but no necessary contradiction is entailed. Romans 5:12 is concerned with cosmological and historical events, while Rom 7:9–11 focuses on the specific anthropological presuppositions which underlie that narrative. Nothing about Rom 5:12 precludes the possibility that Adam succumbs to some inclination or propensity which is metaphorically awakened within him. The second criticism is more probative. It is pointed out that this construal of the narrative (“sin *sprang* to life”) requires an otherwise unattested reduction of force of the prepositional prefix attached to the verb (ἀνά).⁸⁴ The meaning of the verb is “come to life *again*” in its other NT occurrences.⁸⁵ This criticism ought to be accepted; it rightly exposes the fact that Paul does not recount the events of Eden *per se* (neither Adam nor Eve speaks), but rather their recapitulation in the experience of Paul’s “I.” With the verb ἀναζάω Paul refers to the springing to life again of the Edenic sin after it lay dead in the childhood innocence of the flesh, after it lay dormant just as it once lay dormant in Eden.⁸⁶ The dormancy of sin in Eden is still presupposed by Paul’s use of the “I.” It is simply that ἀναζάω does not narrate events in Eden, but rather refers to their *re*occurrence in Paul’s experience.⁸⁷

still thinks his “I” will speak to humanity as a whole (cf. Rom 3:19–20). As usual, for all his universalism, Paul still privileges Jewish identity and symbolic categories. Thus, Adam, while he represents Jew and Gentile, looks more Jewish than Gentile.

- 84 Cf. BDAG s.v. 2 “to function after being dormant, *spring to life*.” ἀναβλέπω 2aβ is cited as an analogous phenomenon.
- 85 Luke 15:24. BDAG s.v. cites three variant readings where the sense is the same: Luke 15:32; Rev 20:5; and Rom 14:9. Cp. ἀναβίω (BDAG s.v. “come to life again”), ἀνάβλεψις (BDAG s.v. “recovery of sight”), ἀναγεννάω (BDAG s.v. “beget again”), ἀναγνωρίζω (BDAG s.v. “become reacquainted with”), ἀναζωπυρέω (BDAG s.v. “rekindle”), ἀναθάλλω (BDAG s.v. “grow up again”).
- 86 This explanation is to be preferred to Dunn’s, who suggests that “Paul probably used the compound lest his strong language be taken to mean that the law created or gave birth to sin”; Dunn, *Romans*, 1:383.
- 87 Käsemann remarks that with λαβούσα “the power of sin is characterized also here as already lying in ambush and present”; *Romans*, 194. On the sense of νεκρός in 7:8 as “inactive,” cf. Cranfield, *Romans*, 1:351, citing Jas 2:17, 26. This compares to sin’s “entrance” into the world in 5:12; in neither case is the language designed to address the coming-into-being-of-sin as a problem for which a defence of God’s righteousness and a demonstration of humanity’s culpability is required. Cf. Lichtenberger on this text: “Paulus rührt heir, ohne in protologishce Spekulationen zu verfallen, an die Frage, die auch von der Paradiesgeschichte her offen bleibt: Wahr kam die Sünde? Die Sünde war da, aber sie war nur ‚lattent‘ vorhanden”; *Das Ich Adams*, 131–32. Thus Bultmann’s repeated statement that “sinning is the origin of sin” applies only superficially; “Romans 7 and the Anthropology of

The second indication pointing back to Eden comes in the reflection offered in v. 11, which looks back at vv. 9–10, and laments that sin took opportunity through the commandment and ἐξηπάτησέν με and through it killed me. In Gen 3:13 Eve replies to God's interrogation by saying, "the serpent ἡπάτησέν με and I ate." Both 2 Cor 11:3 and 1 Tim 2:14 employ the same form as Rom 7:11 (ἐξαπατάω) to refer explicitly to Eve's deception. The first of these text reads: "But I am afraid that as the serpent ἐξηπάτησεν Eve by its cunning, your thoughts will be led astray from a sincere and pure devotion to Christ." Just as in Romans, but in distinction from 1 Tim 2:14, the deception of Eve here is applied generally to male and female, although with the ecclesiological imagery of the bride ("I promised you in marriage to one husband, to present you as a chaste virgin to Christ," 2 Cor 11:2). In fact, this imagery reveals a striking correlation between Rom 7:11 and 2 Cor 11:3. It is the analogy of marriage in 2 Cor 11:2 that leads Paul to think of Eve in v. 3. Likewise, immediately prior to Rom 7:7–12, Paul had used the analogy of marriage to describe the believer's freedom from the law (Rom 7:1–6). Moreover, both 2 Cor 11:2 and Rom 7:3 evoke the prospect of sexual indiscretion on the part of the woman. It is possible that Paul thinks of the transgression of Eve as somehow a breach of her covenantal (i.e., marriage) relationship with Adam⁸⁸ and that both in 2 Cor 11:2 and Rom 7:1–6 the notion of marital infidelity leads him to think of the events of Eden (cf. 1 Cor 6:15–16).⁸⁹ These connections, which are admittedly somewhat opaque, are nevertheless conceivable from a tradition-historical perspective and numerous enough to merit consideration.⁹⁰ In any case, the key point is that the rare word ἐξαπατάω

Paul," in *Existence and Faith: Shorter Writings of Rudolf Bultmann*, Living Age Books (New York: Meridian Books, 1966), 147–57.

88 So Barrett, *From First Adam to Last*, 17; he suggests that it is implied in Adam and Eve's shame.

89 Some have detected this innuendo also in Rom 7:7, which cites the prohibition against coveting, but that is undermined somewhat by v. 8, which speaks of "all kinds of covetousness." Ziesler makes the point in rejection of Gundry's claim that Paul has in mind the onset of sexual desire, with puberty colliding with the time in life of the Jewish boy's *bar mitzvah*; cf. John A. Ziesler, "The Role of the Tenth Commandment in Romans 7," *JSNNT* 33 (1988): 45–46; Gundry, "The Moral Frustration of Paul." Gundry did not allow for an Edenic element, but Ziesler is open to it.

90 Ziesler briefly considers the evidence for a sexual connotation to Eve's sin, citing 4 Macc 18:8; Apoc. Ab. 23; Apoc. Mos. 19:3 (cf. ch. 25); Philo, *Opif.* 152, 157–160; *QG* 1.47–48; *Leg.* 2.72, 74; "Tenth Commandment," 45.

describing sin's deceit in Rom 7:11 is related lexically to Gen 3:13 and explicitly used by Paul to characterize the serpent's deception of Eve in 2 Cor 11:3.⁹¹

Finally, in the sentences that set up Paul's little drama (vv. 7–8), he cites the prohibition against coveting (v. 7; cf. Exod 20:17). Another link to Genesis is supplied therewith. Ἐπιθυμέω in Exod 20:17 translates the Hebrew verb חָמַד (“to desire”) which is used in Gen 3:6 to describe the tree of the knowledge of good and evil as “to be desired (חָמַד) to make one wise” (LXX has ὡραίων ἐστὶν τοῦ κατανοῆσαι). “Covetousness” was commonly regarded as the root of sin (cf. Philo, *Spec.* 4.84–94; *Decal.* 142, 150–153, 173; Jas 1:15; Apoc. Ab. 24:9). In the Life of Adam and Eve covetousness is likewise associated with Eve's deception: “the serpent,” says Eve, “sprinkled his evil poison on the fruit which he gave me to eat which is his covetousness. For covetousness is the origin of every sin” (Apoc. Mos. 19:3). Later Eve characterizes hers as “the sin of the flesh” (25:3). Her sin is certainly comprehensible as an act of covetousness. The combination of all the above evidence clearly suggests Paul has the events of Eden in mind.

The strongest objection to this reading of Paul's little drama concerns the purported “theological incongruity” it creates within Paul's thought, as Moo put it, citing Rom 5:13–14 and Gal 3:17.⁹² The matter has already been addressed.⁹³ The objection neglects to account for the similitude between the sin of Adam and sin under the law, which Paul's reasoning assumes in Rom 5:12–14. As argued above, it is unnecessary to postulate that such similitude means Adam was confronted by *the* Torah, only that both the Edenic commandment and the Mosaic law are expressions of divine law. It has also been argued that the problem in Genesis is *external* (the serpent) and not *internal* as in Paul, but this is a rather flat reading of the primordial history, which goes against the grain of ancient interpretation (cf. Sir 15:14–17; 1QS III 17–21), and it is doubtful that a strict dichotomy of the two types of factors pertains to Paul's own thinking. Another objection is that the couple did not immediately die after eating from the tree. In the example from the Hodayot above, where the “I” is clearly *adamic*, “dust” returns to where it came at the moment of God's anger, but we know events in Eden did not play out exactly in that way, despite the warning of Gen 2:17 (cf., too, Philo, *Leg.* 1.105–108). Finally, it has been objected that Adam was never alive apart from the commandment, but that it was

91 This furthermore coheres with the personification of sin in this passage. Cf. Ben Witherington, *Paul's Narrative Thought World: The Tapestry of Tragedy and Triumph* (Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 1994), 14–15.

92 Moo, *Romans*, 428–29. The criticisms dealt with below are drawn from the sources mentioned in n. 65.

93 Cf. the section “Adam and Christ” in the present chapter.

given immediately. Again, this objection takes on a woodenness of interpretation that simply did not characterize early readers—but let it be entertained. Jubilees famously exploits narrative details to create a chronological framework to cohere with the eternal validity of the law; surely Paul can do the same for his own rhetorical purposes. Eight verses separate the creation of Adam in Gen 2:7 and the giving of the command in Gen 2:16. During this time God plants and waters Eden and then takes Adam to reside there; it is not hard to imagine that this took some time. Alternatively, it can be asked whether the phrase *χωρίς νόμου* (Rom 7:9) needs to imply the lack of awareness of the commandment or only the lack of an experiential knowledge or acquaintance with taking on its demand (cf. Rom 3:21, 28; 4:6), as in the case of the child.⁹⁴ God may command a prairie girl never to jump in the ocean, but she has no practical experience of that law until presented with the opportunity; likewise for Eve and Adam, the fatal operation of the prohibition will not be felt prior to an encounter with the forbidden object.⁹⁵ Thus the presence of an Edenic backdrop in Paul's little drama is coherent with Paul's argument, conceivable on the standards or precedents of ancient readers, and sufficiently indicated by textual cues.⁹⁶

We can now suggest what this means for our topic.⁹⁷

“No longer Adam and Eve?”

We have been conscious throughout that the “I” with which Paul speaks identifies more closely with Eve's experience than Adam's, above all in the confession “it deceived me.” In light of our previous discussions on the problematics of relating gender and the image of God in Paul's thought, this convergence

94 Cf. Jewett, *Romans*, 450–51.

95 Thus, if living “without the law” need not imply lack of awareness of its demands, then the moment when “the commandment came” (v. 9) will be the moment when obedience becomes an existentially present necessity. Notably, Gen 3:1–5 explicitly frames Eve's temptation as an encounter with the commandment (“Did God say . . .?”).

96 Other objections, such as that raised in relation to *ἀναζάω* (above) or to the quotation of the tenth commandment (and allusion to Lev 18:5 in the phrase *ἡ ἐντολή εἰς ζωὴν*, v. 10), are only pertinent to the misinterpretation that Paul's “I” speaks *for* Adam or Eve.

97 It should not be objected that Paul's concern is liberty from the (nevertheless good) law, so that it is unwarranted to speculate about the anthropological ramifications of the presence of the law in Eden. Paul's very point about the law is established by an anthropological presupposition, i.e., the nature of the flesh (Rom 8:3). So also Maston, *Agency*, 127–33. And PHEME PERKINS: “Rom 7:7–25 shows Paul's ability to engage an exegetical tradition which used the Adam story as vehicle for its own reflection on the human condition”; “Pauline Anthropology in Light of Nag Hammadi,” *CBQ* 48 (1986): 516.

of a Pauline “I” with an originally feminine persona might bear on the topic. Austin Busch rightly complains that scholars have virtually ignored the fact that Eve’s experience is reflected rather than Adam’s,⁹⁸ and he offers an insightful reading of Rom 7:7–25 on this basis. He argues that “Paul takes advantage of the tension within th[e] tradition between Eve’s passive victimization and active responsibility at the moment of her transgression in order to develop a double vision of sin and, correspondingly, a picture of the self split under sin.”⁹⁹ There are problems with Busch’s analysis from the perspective of his understanding of Paul’s adaptation of Gen 3. Busch incorrectly understands 7:7–11 as straightforward *prosopopoeia*: the “I” is Eve’s rather than Paul’s. But this falters on formal¹⁰⁰ and technical grounds.¹⁰¹ Rather by interpreting his own highly stylized experience in the light of Eve’s, Paul implies that her experience is not peculiar to women. He may still regard passivity as basically a “feminine” trait (cf. Rom 1:27; 1 Cor 6:9) and may view females as particularly prone to deception (being acted upon) as the author of 1 Tim 2:11–15 does, but he is not concerned to make a point about woman’s responsibility for sin’s entrance into the world (cf. Sir 25:24; Apoc. Mos. 32:2). What Paul does in vv. 7–12 is not unlike what he does in Rom 5:12, where he completely ignored Eve’s role in Eden, despite what he says explicitly of her in 2 Cor 11:3, and asserts that it all happened “by one man.” In either case, Paul does not seem to be particularly concerned to make a point about gender, or of Adam over against Eve or vice versa.

Adam, Innocence, and Law

The significance has largely gone unnoticed: Paul evokes the Eden narrative to illuminate the ongoing phenomenology of human encounter with law. Two reasons suggest that Paul, therefore, is not accustomed to think of Adam and Eve as enjoying a supernatural state of righteousness or glory: Paul associates

98 Busch, “The Figure of Eve,” 14. This is a bit of an overstatement; certainly, the lack of attention to this detail feels particularly egregious to Busch because he understands Paul to be speaking in the person of Eve.

99 Ibid., 23.

100 The first person of vv. 7–8 must be capable of representing Paul, inasmuch as he is making an argument from experience: The “I” in vv. 7ff. must be seen in relation to the “we” in v. 5, where Paul already appealed to experience in anticipation of the elaboration that occurs here; cf. Wilckens, *Der Brief an Die Römer*, 2:76. The drama *per se* occurs only in vv. 9–10, and that “I” must at least overlap with that of vv. 7–8 and 11–12 in order to be relevant.

101 Details do not entirely fit Eve’s situation. The citation of the tenth commandment in v. 7 could be explained as an interpretive gloss (cf., e.g., Laato, *Paul and Judaism*, 104), but the appearance of the verb ἀναζῶω in v. 9 clearly suggests that events in Eden are not being read but relived.

subjection to the authority of divine law not with a condition of maturity but of immaturity; and Paul here wants to illustrate the catalytic function of the law on the normal bodily condition of fleshliness.¹⁰² I begin with the first point.

The operation of law in Eden speaks to Paul's understanding of Adam and Eve as initially innocent and immature. They are minors rather than full grown heirs, or in Paul's language of the image of God, they are earthly rather than heavenly representatives. Philo supplies a remarkable parallel.

In his *Allegorical Interpretation of the Law*, when Philo arrives at the giving of the commandment to Adam in Gen 2:16–17, he asks:

We must raise the question *what* Adam He commands (ἐντέλλεται) and who this is; for the writer has not mentioned him before, but has named him now for the first time.¹⁰³ Perchance, then, he means to give us the name of the man that was moulded. "Call him earth" he says, for that is the meaning of "Adam," so that when you hear the word "Adam," you must make up your mind that it is the earthly and perishable mind; for the mind that was made after the image is not earthly but heavenly. (*Leg.* 1.90)

Employing the allegory of the soul, Philo introduces the distinction between the earthly, perishable mind of Gen 2:7 and the heavenly, imperishable mind created after the image of Gen 1:26–27. The reason for this is that the heavenly mind has no need of the commandment:

Now it is to this being [of Gen 2:7], and not to the being created after His image and after the original idea, that God gives the command. For the latter, even without urging, possesses virtue instinctively; but the former, independently of instruction (διδασκαλίας), could have no part in wisdom. (*Leg.* 1.92)

Having established that the commandment only has relevance for the earthly Adam (mind), Philo proceeds to distinguish between three types of instruction

102 The Edenic setting of these verses is overlooked by Grant Macaskill in "Paradise in the New Testament," in *Paradise in Antiquity: Jewish and Christian Views*, ed. Markus N. A. Bockmuehl and Gedaliahu A. G. Stroumsa (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010), 64–81. His tentative employment of *adamic* glory traditions as background for Pauline Christology here is modified in *Union with Christ*.

103 In the LXX the word ἄνθρωπος is used prior to the sudden appearance of the proper name Ἀδάμ in 2:16.

("injunction, prohibition, command accompanied by exhortation") and to relate these (unevenly) to three kinds of person (93–94). "Prohibition" (πρόσταξις) is addressed to the bad man; "injunction" (ἀπαγόρευσις) concerns the proper performance of duties; and "exhortation" (παραίνεσις), which is linked to commandment, is addressed to the "neutral man" (τὸν μέσον). But to "the perfect man" (ὁ τέλειος) there is need of none of the three kinds of instruction. When he rounds out the discussion, Philo introduces a new category of person, the child (ὁ νήπιος), which corresponds in the need for instruction to the "neutral man"; they are probably one and the same: "The bad man has need of injunction and prohibition, and the child of exhortation and teaching." Thus, the child has need only of the third category of instruction. And he concludes: "Quite naturally, then, does God give the commandments and exhortations before us to the earthly man (τῷ γήινῳ) who is neither bad nor good but midway between these" (95). The earthly being of Gen 2:7 is thus morally analogous to the child, and it is only to him, not the perfect man (the symbol of the soul as the image of God), that God gives the commandment. Philo returns to the childlike innocence of Adam and Eve in connection with their nakedness (Gen 2:25; 3:1) in the second book: "The mind that is clothed neither in vice nor in virtue, but absolutely stripped of either, is naked, just as the soul of an infant, since it is without part in either good or evil, is bared and stripped of coverings" (2.53). In his *On Planting*, Philo again stresses that it is not the man created after the image of God, stamped with the spirit, who is placed in the Garden but the composite man formed of earth:

It was to be expected, then, that God should plant and set in the garden, or the whole universe, the middle or neutral mind (τὸν μέσον νοῦν), played upon by forces drawing it in opposite directions and given the high calling to decide between them, that it might be moved to choose and to shun, to win fame and immortality should it welcome the better, and incur a dishonourable death should it choose the worse. (*Plant.* 44)

Here we have that neutral mind, as yet unaffected by good or bad choices, but subject to opposite inchoate tendencies, whose childlike innocence, as per the above texts, is about to be faced with the fateful prospect that Paul alludes to in Rom 7:9–11. For Paul the encounter is generative and ill-fated, but for Philo the commandment offers not only the opportunity but the means to proceed to maturity (cf. *Decal.* 49–50), though success is not guaranteed. We could comment at length on the differences between Paul and Philo and indulge in a lengthy comparison of their thought, but I call upon the Alexandrian here in order to show that the operation of law in Eden can be readily coordinated

with anthropological speculation and that it also might readily confirm the less than complete development of Adam and Eve.

For Paul, too, the authority of the law pertains to humankind only outside of its maturity.¹⁰⁴ It is not accidental that Paul in Galatians speaks of those under the law as being analogous to “minors” under “guardians and trustees” who await the gift of the spirit (4:1–6; cf. 3:24), and that later he asserts, “if you are led by the Spirit, *you are not subject to the law*” (5:18). Paul, of course, is not speaking about Eden in these texts, but he is drawing on similar themes that Philo applies to distinguish between the Adam fashioned from dust, who has need of instruction, and the one fashioned after the image, to whom, as one possessing virtue instinctively, the commandment is not addressed. Philo might have said, “If you are led by the Spirit, you are not subject to the law. . . . The fruit of the Spirit is love, joy, peace, patience, kindness, generosity, faithfulness, gentleness, and self-control. There is no law against such things” (Gal 5:19, 22–23). Now, if Paul in Rom 7:7–12 can conceive, even indirectly through his own paradigmatic coming-of-age, of the operation of divine law in Eden, it is apparent that at least here the category that best explains his thinking of Adam and Eve is that of childlike immaturity and innocence.

In 1 Cor 3:1 Paul chastised his readers as *σαρκίνοις, νηπίοις* (“fleshly,” “child-like”) rather than *πνευματικός* (“spiritual”), and therefore unable to discern the mind of the Lord. In Paul’s cosmological anthropology, it is the quality of being “flesh,” characteristic of the earthly Adam (1 Cor 15:45–50), which corresponds to a state analogous to immaturity, that coheres with the presence of the commandment in Eden. The normal bodily quality of fleshliness, viewed as it is in itself, is the presumed state of Adam and Eve in Eden, allowing “the catalytic operation of the law” to be illustrated from the Garden episode. The anthropological basis of Paul’s polemic falls out from under it if Adam and Eve are not “in the flesh” wherein “sinful passions” can be “aroused by the law” (Rom 7:5). The Edenic setting, moreover, demonstrates that Paul launched his polemic against the normative authority of the law on a universal anthropological basis.¹⁰⁵

104 On different bases, a similar point is made by Macaskill, *Union with Christ*, 220–38.

105 For extensive argument and documentation, cf. Vlachos, *The Law and the Knowledge*; Vlachos, “Law, Sin, and Death.” Vlachos, however, shies away from exploring the anthropological side of the law’s catalytic operation in Eden; that is, he does not explore Paul’s understanding of Adam *per se*.

Adam, Sin, and Flesh

This use of the Eden narrative is thus another indication of its mythic, prototypical significance for the *everyman* in Paul.¹⁰⁶ The propensity of the flesh to be overcome by “sinful passions” which “work in our members” (7:5; cf. 6:12; 7:23) is modeled on the events of Eden. The use of the verb ἀναζάω recalls this primordial coming to life and sees its (eternal) return in the events here paradigmatically narrated. A theodic construal of these events is completely undermined. Rather, Paul points to *adamic* existence *per se* as having an innate propensity to sin. Sin is simply *there* as a latent potential of fleshly existence, although not yet in v. 9 clearly residing anywhere in particular.¹⁰⁷ The Adam of

106 Two texts which have been thought to reflect a fall from glory deserve comment: Romans, 1:23 and 3:23. The notion of Adam's lost glory cannot be derived from these texts. While the narration of events in Rom 1:20–23 does seem influenced in part by the narratives of Gen 1–3, the key point to be made here is that the “exchange” (ἡλλάξαν; cf. Gen 31:7; Exod 13:30, etc.) of the glory of the immortal God for various creaturely images in v. 23 does *not* refer to a divesting of glory from the subjects themselves (even in the LXX of Ps 106:20, which is alluded to here), but to idolatry: they exchange the worship of God for creaturely things. The text reveals very little about how Paul thinks of Adam and Eve in Eden (*contra* Hooker). Additionally, Rom 3:23 arguably has Adam in mind (cf. 5:12 πάντες ἥμαρτον), but even if we translate the key verb (ὑστεροῦνται) as “lack,” i.e., be deficient in something desirable, rather than “fall short of,” i.e., fail to meet a goal, as Enderlein recently argues, we need not follow him to the conclusion that Paul has in mind an original possession of such glory (cf. Sir 11:11; Matt 19:20). (Enderlein seems to be aware of this and argues for the case based on tradition-historical grounds.) Immortal glory (on the association of glory and immortality, see Blackwell and Levison) is that desirable quality which Adam, being corruptible, was not deprived of but failed to attain. To repeat a common refrain by now: Adam's loss of the possession of supernatural glory is nowhere explicit and undermined consistently (as especially in 1 Cor 11:7; 15:40–49; Rom 7:7–12). On Rom 1:23, cf. Morna D. Hooker, “Adam in Romans 1,” *NTS* 6 (1960): 297–306; eadem, *From Adam to Christ*; Wedderburn, “Adam in Paul's Letter to the Romans,” 413–19; John R. Levison, “Adam and Eve in Romans 1.18–25 and the Greek Life of Adam and Eve,” *NTS* 50 (2004): 519–34; Fitzmyer, *Romans*, 274; Moo, *Romans*, 109. On Rom 3:23, cf. Steven E. Enderlein, “To Fall Short or Lack the Glory of God? The Translation and Implications of Romans 3:23,” *JSPL* 1 (2011): 213–24; Benjamin C. Blackwell, “Immortal Glory and the Problem of Death in Romans 3.23,” *JSNT* 32 (2010): 285–308; Cranfield, *Romans*, 1.204–5; contrast Fitzmyer, *Romans*, 347.

107 In discussion of 7:13–25, which he rightly understands to narrate the impact of 7:7–12, Watson states, “‘Sin that dwells within me’ is not a general bias towards evil that is unfortunately integral to being human. It has an origin and a history, arising as it does from the disastrous encounter with the law narrated in vv. 7–12, and manifested in an ongoing subjection to ‘every kind of desire’ (v. 8);” *Hermeneutics*, 377. This may be true as far as it goes but it does not deal with the common anthropological assumptions that underlie the

Gen 2 still speaks to *adam*: Rom 7:7–12 inserts Eden into the events of the “I.”¹⁰⁸ However, it must be acknowledged that this is an idyllic “I” of youthful innocence lost. Here the change in tense from the quasi-mythic past of the “I” in Rom 7:7–12 to the existential present of vv. 14–25 must also be accounted for. This change reflects the fact that the Edenic scenario is not played out repeatedly in the individual life—childhood comes to an end—certainly not without degrees of relative difference. With its entrance, sin quickly and inevitably takes up residence, in Paul’s scenario. Like the house-guest of horror stories, it overstays its welcome and then binds and slays you. Echoes of the Edenic drama recede from the voice that speaks in 7:14–25, and what emerges is the normal “I” of human existence. “For we know that the law is spiritual; but I am fleshly, sold into slavery under sin,” says Paul (7:14).¹⁰⁹ This is now an “I” subject to the powers of sin and death, Adam and Eve after innocence, after Eden. To put it differently, this “I” speaks no longer *after the model of* Eden but *in* Adam, that is, in the history of the effects of Adam’s sin.¹¹⁰

appearance of sin in 7:7–12 and its domination in vv. 13–25. Something about the human constitution allows sin to activate, spring to life in the body, and take over. The attempt to avoid this implication (“unlike the situation of the fall, sin is already present within the human being who hears the law”) appears strained in Seifrid: on the one hand, “Paul sees in the human encounter with the commandment the recapitulation of Adam’s transgression,” but on the other, “Paul was once ‘alive’ insofar as he is viewed as an individual apart from his connection with Adam”; “Romans,” in *Commentary on the New Testament*, 632.

108 Käsemann objects to this interpretation, a luxury afforded only because he argues, falsely, I believe, that the “I” is Adam: “There is nothing in the passage which does not fit Adam, and everything fits Adam alone”; Käsemann, *Romans*, 196. Similarly, Lichtenberger appeals to the past tense of vv. 7–13, explaining that “zunächst einmal wird ja die Geschichte Adams erzählt. Diese kann in ihren Einzelzügen nicht einfach auf jedes andere ‚Ich‘ übertragen werden. Und doch ist, was Adam tat, für jeden bestimmend, und was seine Begegnung mit dem Gesetz erbrachte, offenbart sich, wo immer die adamitische Existenz dem Gebot Gottes begegnet”; Lichtenberger, *Das Ich Adams*, 134.

109 The NRSV (and ESV) have “the law is spiritual, but I am *of the flesh*,” even though both adjectives are nominative, πνευματικός, σάρκινος. Paul probably can think of the primal couple as being σάρκινος in the more neutral sense of that word; cf. 2 Cor 3:3, usually translated “human” (ἐν πλαξὶν καρδίαις σαρκίνας) or 1 Cor 3:1, where it designates immaturity (ἀλλ’ ὡς σαρκίνοις, ὡς νηπίοις ἐν Χριστῷ) and is related to ψυχικός as opposed to πνευματικός (2:13–15), terminology which reappears in connection with Adam and Christ (15:45–49). Here (Rom 7:14) its negative associations emerge, but this is because of contextual factors, Paul’s being “sold under sin.” That state is not synonymous with “fleshliness” *per se*; he was not “sold under sin” (except, perhaps, by fate) in the time of innocence which he describes in 7:9.

110 Thus, I follow the interpretation that Rom 7:14–25 speaks to existence as determined by Adam. The will to do good (15–21) and the delight in the law of God (v. 22) are completely ineffective against sin; this picture stands in too strong a contrast with the deliverance

Flesh is thus naturally corruptible, physically and morally, but not in itself “evil.” For Paul, sinfulness comes to fore in the individual in sinful *passions and acts*.¹¹¹ When he draws on the scriptures, primarily the Psalms, to demonstrate human sinfulness, it is to descriptions of pervasive deeds of sinfulness that he turns (Rom 3:10–18, citing LXX Ps 13:1–3; Eccl. 7:20; LXX Pss 5:10; 139:4; 9:28; Isa 59:7–8; Ps 35:2).¹¹² This corresponds to Paul’s conviction that the “image of God” is borne in the bodily constitution of humanity (1 Cor 11:7; 15:45–49). While Paul does speak of the “body of sin” (τὸ σῶμα τῆς ἁμαρτίας, Rom 6:6) and “sinful flesh” (σαρκὸς ἁμαρτίας, 8:3), this is a description of the body fallen under the power of sin, not a characteristic of bodies in themselves.¹¹³ He also speaks of sin dwelling “in the members” (ἐν τοῖς μέλεσιν, 7:5), which plainly distinguishes sin from the body of flesh *per se*. Even perhaps his most radical statement concerning the flesh preserves this distinction: Οἶδα γὰρ ὅτι οὐκ οἰκεῖ ἐν ἐμοί, τοῦτ’ ἔστιν ἐν τῇ σαρκί μου, ἀγαθόν (“for I know that good does not dwell within me, that is, in my flesh,” 7:18),¹¹⁴ which is misinterpreted as

celebrated in 7:4–6 and 8:2–4 (or even Gal 5:16–26) in order to describe the same state. This means that Paul’s anthropology does contain concepts comparable not only to the *יצר הרע* but also the *יצר הטוב*, the key fact being that the inclination to do good is weakened by the flesh, where the inclination toward evil finds its entry point. This correlates to Rom 2:14–15, where Paul conceives of Gentiles doing what the law requires, evidencing its inscription on their hearts. Similarly, Paul at the conclusion of Rom 7:21–25, discusses the delight in the law of God with the mind in opposition to the law of sin in his members. The rhetorical demands of Rom 2:14–15 and 7:14–25 should be allowed to balance each other in terms of human capacity to do good; nevertheless, in view not only of Rom 3:19 but also 5:12–21 and here, 7:14–25, it is apparent that Paul does not at all share Ben Sira’s optimism about the strength of the right side to stand tall in this tug of war (Sir 15:11–20). On the evil inclination in Paul, cf. Joel Marcus, “The Evil Inclination in the Letters of Paul,” *IBS* 8 (1986): 8–21. On the comparison of Paul and Ben Sira in terms of agency, cf. Maston, *Agency*.

- 111 This is not to deny the transhistorical dimension of sin whereby it functions as an “antecedent power with fateful character in every human life”; Schnelle, *Apostle Paul*, 500. The point is that from many angles this is the product of initial and continued human disobedience, whereby historical and cosmological conditions have become distorted and taken on an anti-god character of their own, and secondly that Paul, as I go on to note, retains a sense of the fundamental dignity of the human person (including the body) *per se*.
- 112 Cf. Watson, *Hermeneutics*, 57–66. Likewise, in Rom 1–2 the emphasis is on the dishonouring of bodies and sinful deeds.
- 113 This would explain the use of ἐν ὁμοιώματι in this verse in its application of the phrase “sinful flesh” to Christ. His, indeed, was real flesh (so 1:3), but it was not implicated in what Paul thinks normal of flesh.
- 114 Cf. Keck, *Romans*, 189. Contrast most translations, e.g., the NRSV: “For I know that nothing good dwells within me, that is, in my flesh.” What is at issue is the lack of the power to do good, as the second half of v. 18 develops with explanatory γὰρ: “For I have the desire to

saying, “Flesh is . . . evil.”¹¹⁵ Paul can speak equally of presenting the very same members (τὰ μέλη) as instruments of righteousness (Rom 6:13; cf. v. 19; 12:1). At the same time, however, the flesh, the mortal body (τὸ θνητὸν τὸ σῶμα, 6:12), basically remains “dead because of sin” (8:10). Paul seems to be reacting to the fact that the body still *dies*—the outer man wastes away (2 Cor 4:16)—despite the believer’s redemption: a sign that sin has and continues to prevent transformation. Outwardly, people still bear the image of the earthly Adam.¹¹⁶ He also states elsewhere that “flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God,” where he imagines mortality being swallowed up by immortality (1 Cor 15:50–53). The operative assumption undergirding Paul’s thinking about the body, sin, and death appears to be that physical corruptibility corresponds to moral corruptibility, and that moral corruption seals the corruption of the body. Flesh, in particular, becomes a leitmotif of moral corruption because it corresponds to bodies in their earthly rather than heavenly determination.

We find, then, in Rom 7:7–12 the same convergence of the historical and mythical sense of “Adam” as in Rom 5:12: Adam’s sin creates the historical conditions which determine the sin and death of his descendants, *for thereby he passes on his humanity*.¹¹⁷ The Edenic encounter with the commandment illustrates the flesh, law, sin nexus, which Paul portrays in his very own youth. Paul’s ability to portray Adam and Eve as under the authority of the commandment both confirms their initial childlike innocence and immaturity but also, in this context, their possession of normal human ontology, the corruptible

do what is right, but not the ability to carry it out” (ESV). In the “flesh” operates “the law of sin” (7:23). If Paul were looking to designate a part of the body, i.e., “flesh,” as ontologically evil, he would not also speak of sin’s operation “in the members” as synonymous with “in the flesh” (v. 18a, 23) and yet also of the “the members” as potential “instruments of righteousness” (6:13, 19).

115 Barrett, *Romans*, 139.

116 Cf. Wedderburn’s reflections: “Adam in Paul’s Letter to the Romans,” 422.

117 The statement is purposefully designed to exclude the cosmological impact of Adam’s sin, just as it is not to the fore in Rom 7 itself, which makes the environment in which sin comes to life in his descendants somewhat different than the semi-idyllic setting of Eden. The result is to heighten the fateful character of this process, its inevitability. Sin takes on more and more the character of a hostile antecedent power. Still, even the supposed idealism of Eden should not be stated absolutely, for surely the serpent marks a negative environmental pressure of which Paul is aware in 2 Cor 11:3; it is perhaps not accidental that Paul narrates his own trip to paradise in the next chapter and that it too is connected with satanic opposition (2 Cor 12:1–9), although it is not clear that this occurs in paradise; cf. Robert M. Price, “Punished in Paradise (An Exegetical Theory on 2 Corinthians 12:1–10),” *JSNT* 7 (1980): 33–40; C. R. A. Morray-Jones, “Paradise Revisited (2 Cor 12:1–12): The Jewish Mystical Background of Paul’s Apostolate,” *HTR* 86 (1993): 265–92.

flesh. If these things are only indirectly derived from Paul's adoption of an Edenic "I" to representatively narrate his own experience, they at least fit comfortably with everything we have discovered thus far.

Creation and the Children of God: Romans 8:18–23

Romans 8:18–23 draws into one concentrated text—conceptually centered on an allusion to Gen 1–3—many of the threads of its own chapter, and of our entire discussion of Paul up to this point.¹¹⁸ In this text, Paul discusses the symbiotic connection between humanity and creation in the context of the purpose of God. The influence of the creation narratives (Gen 1–3) here is basically accepted in scholarship, and the points which are necessary to make perhaps suffer more from a lack of emphasis than the diverging contentions of scholars, so our discussion will follow a more direct route than has sometimes previously been the case.¹¹⁹ Finally, too, Paul suggests elements of a perspective on the perennial question which hangs over every thought of human alienation and suffering, not least in the context of creation by God, *Why?*

Paul does something remarkable in the present text. He links creation's subjection to futility to the curses of Gen 3:14–19, and with that establishes an anthropological hinge both to its protological (and persistent) predicament and its eschatological fulfillment.¹²⁰ The text in the NRSV reads:

118 The references to "suffering" and "glory" in v. 18 emerge immediately from the use of those terms in v. 17, where the important concept of joint inheritance with Christ is broached (cf. Rom 5:17; Gal 3:25–4:6; 1 Cor 15:24–28). The subjection of the creation "in hope" points backward to humankind's sin (Rom 5:12) and forward to the discussion of God's purpose in vv. 28–30 (cf. Rom 5:17–21; 1 Cor 15:24–28). The revelation of the children of God with the adoption and the redemption of the body (v. 18, 19, 21, 23) links with the specific purpose that God predestined the called "to be conformed to the image of his Son" (vv. 29–30; cf. 1 Cor 14:45–50; 2 Cor 3:18; Phil 3:21). The designation of the "spirit" as first fruits links backward to 8:1–17 and forward to vv. 26–27 (cf. 2 Cor 3:18; 5:5).

119 Certainly, however, a good share of ambiguities remain.

120 Hahne discusses the view of Olle Christoffersson, *The Earnest Expectation of the Creature: The Flood-Tradition as Matrix of Romans 8:18–27*, CBNT 23 (Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell, 1990), citing pp. 104, 120–24, who argues that the "sons of God" are angels; cf. Harry Hahne, *The Corruption and Redemption of Creation: Nature in Romans 8.19–22 and Jewish Apocalyptic Literature*, LNTS 336 (New York: T & T Clark, 2006), 184–86. However, the references to the sonship of believers in vv. 14–17 and 23, the distinction between believers and creation in v. 23, and the new kind of familial relationship inaugurated between Christ and now glorified believers in v. 29 suggest that we can be confident that redeemed humanity is in view. Susan Eastman's argument that the revelation of the "sons

¹⁸ I consider that the sufferings of this present time are not worth comparing with the glory about to be revealed to us. ¹⁹ For the creation waits with eager longing for the revealing of the children of God; ²⁰ for the creation was subjected to futility (τῇ γὰρ ματαιότητι ἡ κτίσις ὑπετάγη), not of its own will but by the will of the one who subjected it, in hope ²¹ that the creation itself will be set free from its bondage to decay (φθορᾶς) and will obtain the freedom of the glory of the children of God. ²² We know that the whole creation has been groaning in labor pains (συστενάζει καὶ συνωδίνει)¹²¹ until now; ²³ and not only the creation, but we ourselves, who have the first fruits of the Spirit, groan inwardly while we wait for adoption,¹²² the redemption of our bodies.

The allusion to Gen 3:14–19 and 5:29 occurs in v. 20—the subjection of creation to futility (cf. 4 Ezra 7:10–12; 9:20; LAE 34; 2 Bar. 56:5),¹²³ which appears to recall especially the curse on the ground which Adam suffers for his disobedience.¹²⁴

of God" (v. 19) includes Israel does not significantly alter my limited aims in this section: "Whose Apocalypse? The Identity of the Sons of God in Romans 8:19," *JBL* 121 (2002): 263–77.

- 121 The NET has "groans and suffers." The reference to "labour pains" is in part a product of reading the two verbs as hendiadys, but this is not necessary; cf. Laurie J. Braaten, "The Groaning Creation: The Biblical Background for Romans 8:22," *BR* 50 (2005): 20–21.
- 122 The term is omitted in several witnesses, mostly Western, likely because it seems to conflict with v.15. It is, however, the more difficult and better attested reading. Cf. Metzger, *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament*, s.v.; Brendan J. Byrne, *Sons of God, Seed of Abraham: A Study of the Idea of the Sonship of God of All Christians in Paul against the Jewish Background*, AnBib 83 (Rome: Biblical Institute, 1979), 109 n. 119.
- 123 There has been considerable discussion concerning the referent of κτίσις (vv. 19, 20, 21, 22), but "natural world" makes excellent sense of the context. The dialectic between humankind and κτίσις suggests that the term refers specifically to the non-human world, although Eastman argues that unbelieving humanity is included: Eastman, "Whose Apocalypse?" 273–76. Cf. the survey and argument in support of the non-human cosmos in Hahne, *Corruption*, 176–81; also Wilckens, *Der Brief an Die Römer*, 2:152–53. The personification of κτίσις is not at all surprising in a text with apocalyptic qualities; again, cf. Hahne, *Corruption*, 165–68.
- 124 Objecting to this interpretation, Braaten cautions, "In Gen 3:17, God's curse on the arable ground is 'on account of' Adam (בעבורך). The result is not an extensive fall of the created order, but rather the production of thorns which make Adam's agricultural tasks more difficult and less productive. In other words, it seems that the curse is primarily on human labor in connection with the ground, not on God's creation *per se*"; Braaten, "Groaning Creation," 22–23. In reply it should be noted that the serpent, the woman, and humanity all suffer ill-effects resulting from Adam and Eve's disobedience and not simply

The word *ματαιότης* (“futility”) glosses the Hebrew *הבל* and *שווא* in the LXX and is overwhelmingly found in Ecclesiastes. As Fitzmyer states, “It denotes the state of ineffectiveness of something that does not attain its goal or purpose; concretely, it means the chaos, decay, and corruption (8:21) to which humanity has subjected God’s noble creation.”¹²⁵ There is perhaps corroborating evidence that we have here a recollection of Genesis in that the cognate verb appeared in Rom 1:20, where again Genesis is detected, to describe the cognitive impact of humankind’s neglect of the knowledge of God in creation. The groaning and labour pains of v. 22 have also been connected to the multiplication of pains in child-labour of Gen 3:16 (note the cognate *σπεναγμός*),¹²⁶ to which the reference here would have to represent a sort of metaphorical reapplication, but this is not certain. Indeed, while the allusion to Genesis in general commands wide agreement, it is not without difficulties.¹²⁷ These are basically two: in the present text, God, it seems, rather than Adam subjects creation,¹²⁸ and the subjection is done “in hope,” not as a matter of curse. These two difficulties share one solution: the passage is oriented toward the unfolding of God’s plan in the eschatological future. Moreover, God’s active role can be readily detected in Genesis: God is the subject of 3:16 (“I will greatly multiply . . .”) and the language

the ground; this broaches something more like an adversely affected “created order”—animal, humanity, earth. Moreover, the question is not whether Paul has rightly read Genesis, but whether there is evidence he is thinking of Genesis and traditions around it when he refers to the futility of creation. Jonathan Moo adopts Braaten’s suggestion that Isa 24–27 informs Paul’s discussion of the ongoing suffering of creation, and expands on it to include the believer’s endurance and the hope of resurrection, but without rejecting the influence of Gen 3: “it seems nearly certain that Genesis 3 has influenced Paul’s thinking in Romans 8”; “Romans 8.19–22 and Isaiah’s Cosmic Covenant,” *NTS* 54 (2008): 84.

125 Fitzmyer, *Romans*, 507.

126 Cf. David Toshio Tsumura, “An OT Background to Rom 8:22,” *NTS* 40 (1994): 620–21.

127 Arguing for perhaps an implausible degree of harmony between Paul’s thought and Darwinian evolution, Christopher Southgate too strongly resists the allusion to Gen 3:17–19: *The Groaning of Creation: God, Evolution, and the Problem of Evil* (Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 2008), 95–96. While, as I understand Rom 8:18–23 there is less friction between Paul and Darwin than in the views Southgate opposes, it does not seem possible in Paul’s thought to dissociate human sin from the actual presence of death in the world, such that the travail of creation can be mapped on to the evolutionary struggle itself, which of course began long before any humans were around to sin. Laurie Braaten’s critique of the interpretation that Gen 3:14–19 stands behind Rom 8:20 is addressed solely to a singular fall of creation; Braaten, “Groaning Creation,” 22–24.

128 Lampe argues for Adam but admits that finally the difference is not great; G. W. H. Lampe, “New Testament Doctrine of Ktisis,” *Mid-Stream* 4 (1964): 79. For God as subject, cf. Fitzmyer, *Romans*, 507–8; Wilckens, *Der Brief an Die Römer*, 154.

of curse (vv. 17–19) is by nature performative. The stressing of God's role here, as opposed to humankind's, facilitates the sense that *even this* has its place in the divine plan. If our argument earlier in Romans has been sound, then it will have been rhetorically effective for Paul to stress the divine plan here, for the sense of inevitability to human sin has been palpable, extending right back to Adam.¹²⁹

Before asking what sort of reading of Gen 1–3 this allusion might be taken to entail, it will be well to determine what precisely is meant by the creation's subjection to futility and its subsequent freedom. It is worth pausing on this question, even though the answer is not in doubt: Paul defines the “futility” more specifically in the next verse as “bondage to decay” (v.21).¹³⁰ While the word φθορά can carry a moral connotation (Wis 14:12, 25; 2 Pet 1:4; 2:19), it more typically refers to material decay (e.g., Exod 18:18; Isa 24:3; Gal 6:8; Col 2:24; both senses appear in 2 Pet 2:12). In speaking of κτίσις the latter sense is predominant. Although human disobedience is prominent in the background—and the tradition—as the cause for this bondage, the main emphasis in speaking of the creation's subjection to futility is brought out in the total context by the contrast between corruption and incorruption (“glory”), focusing on material states.¹³¹ It is noteworthy that “futility” is not said to be a condition of “corruption” alone but τῆς δουλείας τῆς φθορᾶς (v. 21). The aspect of futility (of not achieving a goal) may derive from the experience of “bondage to corruption” (objective genitive) rather than a bondage that inheres *in* corruption *per se*

129 It should be noted that creation's *involuntary* subjection does seem to imply an implicit contrast with humanity (cf. Rom 1:21; 5:12), whom Paul addresses separately (as redeemed humanity) from creation in v. 23. There can be no doubt that Paul treats humans as willful and culpable, but this is far from a fully developed doctrine of free will such as we see emerging in Sir 15:14–15. Nor can one assume that Gen 2–3 implies free will; cf. the warnings of Ricoeur, *The Symbolism of Evil*, 233–34. We have detected no evidence that Paul engages in speculation in order to resolve issues of divine determination and human willing: both appear to operate. Eastman uses this tension in fact to argue that humanity *is* included in the subjection to futility, noting the passives ἐματαιώθησαν and ἐσκοτίσθη of Rom 1:21, the threefold “handing over” of v. 24, 26, 28, and the themes emerging in chs. 9–11: “Whose Apocalypse?” 274–75.

130 For an interpretation of this text as partaking of larger motifs of the New Exodus, yet without excluding the background of Gen 3, cf. Sylvia C. Keesmaat, *Paul and His Story: (Re-)Interpreting the Exodus Tradition*, JSNTSup 181 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1999); eadem, “Exodus and the Intertextual Transformation of Tradition in Romans 8:14–30,” *JSNT* 54 (1994): 29–56.

131 Cf. Hahne, *Corruption*, 154–56, 194–95.

(genitive of apposition).¹³² Elsewhere, Paul treats the corruptibility of the material world as simply given in its creation (cf. 1 Cor 15:42–44). This bondage then will be the product of creation's subjection to the influence of sinful humanity, preventing its own flourishing. The probable echoes of prophetic language (esp. in v. 22) that describe the destruction and mourning of the earth because of human sin support this reading (Isa 24:4–6; Jer 4:27–31; Zeph 1:2–3; Joel 1:10–12, 17–20).¹³³

The relationship between creation and humanity is one of mirrored and not simply related destinies.¹³⁴ Earlier in Romans Paul spoke of the “mortal (θνητός) body” (6:12) and in 1 Cor 15:42 he spoke of the human body as being characterized by φθορά, where the corruptible body appears equivalent to that of the man taken from the earth (v. 47). Earth and body are related in protology. Moreover, when the body comes to share in “glory” or ἀφθαρσία (Rom 8:17, 21, 23; 1 Cor 15:42),¹³⁵ Paul also speaks of the creation obtaining “the freedom of the glory of the children of God.”¹³⁶ “Freedom” here is explicitly contrasted with “bondage to corruption” (v. 21); it describes a change in the state of creation which will be made possible because it benefits from or shares in “glory” that in the first instance characterizes “the sons of God.”¹³⁷ Creation goes from the state of being corruptible to incorruptible when humankind, taken from

132 Hahne notes a third possibility, the subjective genitive (slavery that comes from corruption), but he also prefers the objective sense. He does not, however, note the nuance that corruption *per se* may be distinguished from futility, and instead consistently treats “corruption” along with “futility” as direct effects of Adam’s “fall.” *Ibid.*, 194.

133 Such traditions are emphasized by Braaten, Keesmaat, and J. Moo. It has been thought that the aorist ὑπετάγη (v. 20) militates against this background, but probably “at most, the aorist verb in verse 20 (‘was subjected’) might refer to God’s initial act of subjecting the creation to the abuse that will be done to it by fallen humanity”; Richard Bauckham, “The Story of the Earth according to Paul: Romans 8:18–23,” *RevExp* 108 (2011): 93. However, Bauckham goes on to argue for too firm a distinction between “death as a universal feature of the animal and vegetable creations” stemming from Gen 3 and “processes of ecological degradation and destruction” such as the prophets describe. *Ibid.*, 94.

134 This goes beyond the “solidarity between humanity and nature” as expressed by Hahne, *Corruption*, 214–15; as well as the tradition of “common fate” spoken of by Byrne, *Sons of God*, 105. It also looks like the typological relationship between creation and humankind that informed the argument of 1 Cor 15:35–50.

135 On this relationship in general in Romans, cf. Blackwell, “Immortal Glory and the Problem of Death in Romans 3.23.”

136 Literally, the construction is freed *from* decay *to* freedom.

137 The genitive in the phrase “freedom of the glory” will then be one of content or source, but not “glorious freedom” (KJV, RSV, NIV), which dilutes the central term of the whole passage; cf. Hahne, *Corruption*, 198; Moo, *Romans*, 517 n. 48; Cranfield, *Romans*, 1:415–16.

its crumbling soil, reaches the full maturity of sons and itself first possesses glory.¹³⁸ The collapse of the present dualism of heaven and earth is being imagined. Paul appears to be thinking along the lines of the apocalyptic visions of a new heaven and earth (cf. Isa 65:17–25; 66:22; 1 En. 45:4–5; Jub. 4:26; 2 Pet 3:13; Rev 21–22; 4 Ezra 7:30–31, 75; 2 Bar. 31:6–32:7; 2 En. 65:8–11) as a sort of cosmic participation in God's incorruptibility (cf., esp., 4 Ezra 7:30–31; 2 Bar. 31:6–32:7),¹³⁹ bequeathed to and through those who (with Christ, v. 17) stand between God and world (cf. 1 Cor 15:24–28).¹⁴⁰ As we sensed in Rom 5:12 (with v. 17), the fate of the body is by definition a cosmic phenomenon. The relationship between humankind and world depicted here confirms the allusion to Gen 3:14–19, where Adam's return to dust (v. 19) is the climax of worsened conditions in creation and the corollary of being cut off from the tree whose fruit is eternal life. The creation in Paul's thought is profoundly *anthropotelic*.¹⁴¹

The entwined *telos* of the creation in the human condition reflects the integral role that humanity is depicted to have within the world's own becoming in texts such as Gen 1:26–30; 2:15; and Ps 8. The thematically linked notions of being joint-heirs of all things with Christ (v.17; 8:32) and of conformation to the image of Christ (v. 29) contribute to this overall picture and anchor Paul's discourse in what are contextually anthropogonic motifs in scriptural tradition.

The motif of inheritance ("heirs of God and joints heirs with Christ," v. 17) emerged as the corollary to sonship and adoption (ὑιοθεσία, vv. 15, 23; 9:4; Gal 4:5; Eph 1:5), which are qualities emerging from the possession of the spirit (vv. 14–15). But this sonship and adoption inclines to a future realization (v. 23). The children of God do not come into their inheritance until they are glorified. Brendan Byrne writes, "the description of the eschatological blessings and specifically eternal life in 'inheritance' terms is characteristic of the Jewish background . . . which comes to the fore explicitly in Rom 4 and Gal 3–4."¹⁴² While eternal life is certainly the framework of Paul's discussion, Byrne focuses a

138 "The 'bodily' character of the resurrection manifests the resurrection as an event that not only occurs in time but also signals the 'bodily' ontological transformation of the created order in the kingdom of God"; Beker, *Triumph*, 157.

139 Byrne writes, "The thought in v. 21 is that creation also . . . will gain this incorruptibility by winning its own share of the divine glory, mediated through the elect"; *Sons of God*, 107–8.

140 In Romans, however, Paul's thought does not go so far as to depict the final submission of the Son prior to God's being "all in all."

141 Cf. Sheila E. McGinn, "All Creation Groans in Labor: Paul's Theology of Creation in Romans 8:18–32," in *Earth, Wind, and Fire: Biblical and Theological Perspectives on Creation*, ed. Barbara Ellen Bowe, Carol J. Dempsey, and Mary Margaret Pazdan (Minneapolis: Liturgical Press, 2004), 114–23; Lampe, "Ktisis," 78–79.

142 Byrne, *Sons of God*, 101–2.

little too exclusively on it (“To be an ‘heir (of God)’ is to be one destined to receive the inheritance of eternal life from his hands”).¹⁴³ There is a parallel conception at work in the Hodayot: God gives “an inheritance (לְהִנְחִילָם) in all the glory of *adam* for long life” (1QH^a IV 27), a concept which is expanded on in the next column: “By your splendour you glorify him, and you give [him] dominion [with] abundant delights together with eternal peace and long life” (V 34–35). The concept of the inheritance involves taking possession of creation as sovereigns in the condition of eternal life. The same associations are made in Romans. Later in the chapter Paul asks, “He who did not withhold his own Son, but gave him up for all of us, will he not with him also *give us everything else?*” (or better “all things,” τὰ πάντα ἡμῖν χαρίζεται, v. 32; cf. the χάρισμα of 5:16). The cosmic scope to the concept of inheritance elucidates the transition from the inheritance motif in vv. 15–17 to the discussion of the creation in vv. 18–23. The connection is confirmed by Rom 4:13: the promise to Abraham was that he would be κληρονόμον κόσμου. Thus as the sons of God are glorified and come into their inheritance of “all things,” the creation too experiences its freedom. Something more than mere sequence is at work.¹⁴⁴ Rather, Paul sees here the beneficent consequences for the cosmos of the fulfillment of human destiny to rule over creation (Gen 1:26–29; Ps 8), for it issues in the destruction of the powers of chaos that are unleashed from within it when it stands outside of the sovereignty of God, which God has designed to exercise through humanity (cf. 1 Cor 15:24–28). This is why creation must wait with eager longing for the revealing of the sons of God. The fundamentally anthropological quality of this vision should not be lost, but it comes only to fruition through participation in the suffering and glorification of Christ (“we suffer with him so that we may also be glorified with him,” v. 17).

This leads to the second manner in which Paul’s discussion in vv. 18–23 is a development of anthropogonic traditions. The redemption of the body (v. 23) which brings to pass the “freedom of the glory of the children of God” (v. 21) is later expressed as conformation to the image of Christ, which is expounded in the contextually pertinent category of sonship: “For those whom he foreknew he also predestined to be conformed to the image of his Son (συμμόρφους τῆς εἰκόνος τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ), in order that he might be the firstborn within a large family (πρωτότοκον ἐν πολλοῖς ἀδελφοῖς)” (v. 29).¹⁴⁵ Paul now brings the relational categories of 1 Cor 15:20–28 and Rom 7:7–12 into direct connection with his image discourses (1 Cor 15:45–50, et al.). Here there can be little doubt

143 Ibid., 101.

144 As Hultgren’s comments might suggest: *Romans*, 321.

145 Cf. the analysis of this text in Byrne, *Sons of God*, 116–18.

that conformation to the image of Christ refers to coming to possess a body conformed to his glorious, incorruptible body (cf. Phil 3:21).¹⁴⁶ According to 1 Cor 15:45–50, as argued above, this is understood on the model of the duality of heaven and earth, and *not* on the restoration of Adam's lost or defaced image.¹⁴⁷ We saw that duality as something that Paul detects in the context of Gen 1, where it is also inscribed into the concept of the creation of humankind κατὰ the image of God (Gen 1:26–27). Thus the language of Rom 8:29 is coherent with Paul's use of the second Adam concept in 1 Cor 15:45–50, as long as we recognize that that concept does not look backward (to some quality Adam lost) but forward (to the resurrected Christ as a new Adam, head of a new heavenly humanity).¹⁴⁸ The conceptual coherence of “image” and sonship lies in the fact that the image of God expresses a likeness to the divine which inheres in the body, analogously to the concept of family resemblance (Gen 5:2–3), and

146 Cf. Lorenzen, *Eikon-Konzept*, 204–11. Following Steenburg's analysis of μορφή and εἰκόν, which identifies the former term as emphasizing the visible and the latter capable of a deeper representative signification, Lorenzen also argues that μορφή serves to define the event specifically as coming to possess a body like Christ's (pp. 207–8).

147 Byrne, while recognizing the coherence between 1 Cor 15:45–50; Phil 3:20–21; 2 Cor 3:18 and 4:6, objects to seeing a reference to Christ as the image of God in this text, which would “overload the language” where there is in fact no “explicit allusion”; *Sons of God*, 125. The caution is welcomed. But the combined occurrence of this language elsewhere with explicit and strongly implied allusions to “image of God” (2 Cor 3:18 + 4:4; Phil 3:21 + 2:6–7; 1 Cor 15:45–50 + 11:7) and its occurrence here in the context of a reflection on the relationship of humankind to creation does not make such an allusion seem overloaded. Unfortunately, the only possibility in which Byrne conceives of such an allusion functioning would be on the model of the restoration of the image of God, lost by Adam's sin. That, indeed, is not alluded to here, nor anywhere in Paul. Moo's formulation illustrates the confusion of this view; he thinks an implicit negative comparison with Adam is in the background and says, “Adam, created in God's ‘image’ (LXX εἰκόν) has tragically ‘transformed’ that image into one that is ‘earthly,’ sin-marred; and this image is what is now imprinted on all who were descended from him”; *Romans*, 534 n. 151. This is a much skewed allusion to the language of 1 Cor 15:45–50.

148 More accurate than Byrne and Moo in the previous note is PHEME PERKINS: “Neither Philo nor Paul treat Adam's disobedience as having lost or disfigured the divine ‘image,’ which then required a new Adam to restore.” But when she proceeds, saying, “Therefore, one should not presume that when Paul refers to the culmination of salvation as coming to share the image of God's Son in Rom 8:29, he is referring to Christ as a second Adam,” she reflects more the predominate interpretations of the “second Adam” concept than Paul's own use of it to refer to the heavenly Christ standing at the head of a new humanity, as argued earlier; “Adam and Christ in the Pauline Epistles,” in *Celebrating Paul: Festschrift in Honor of Jerome Murphy-O'Connor, O. P., and Joseph A. Fitzmyer, S. J.*, ed. Peter Spitaler (Washington, DC: Catholic Biblical Association of America, 2012), 146.

that the image mediates God's presence and will to creation.¹⁴⁹ Remarkably, these associations—between image, bodiliness, and familial inheritance—are retained in Paul's use of the categories.¹⁵⁰ Genesis 1:26–27, therefore, is central to an anthropology of hope in Paul, but in the qualified sense that it holds out hope that the earthly image might also take of the fruit of the tree of life and come to possess the kind of life that characterizes the Son of God (the heavenly image). It is only in this way that Paul sees humankind as actually being empowered to adequately fulfill its commission as described in Gen 1:26–28 and the eighth Psalm, although a start is made in this life by those who are indwelt by the spirit.

In closing the discussion of Rom 8:18–23, before I offer elements of a broader perspective on the questions of sin and suffering in Paul, it needs to be stressed that the subjection of creation to decay no more suggests a prior state of “aesthetic perfection” or incorruption than did the condemnation of humankind to death, although a contrast, a before and after, is naturally implied. According to 1 Cor 15:45–50, the corruptibility of Adam is a product of his being taken from the corruptible earth. In the case of both humankind and creation, the sense might be of an initial condition of good functioning and fecundity which still needed to be acted upon for its flourishing. John Gibbs calls this a “dynamic ontology.”¹⁵¹ The creation has not fallen from a state of *incorruption*, such as Paul anticipates, to *corruption*. The creation has always been waiting for the bearers of the image to grow up into Christ.¹⁵² But, certainly, it has not always been waiting with the same burden and long-suffering, the same “futility.”¹⁵³

149 The bodiliness of the image and its expression as a matter of sonship and adoption again remind us of the ambiguities surrounding gender and the image of God, but this text takes us no further in our comprehension of that problem.

150 Worthington comments on some of these relationships, but it is not clear that Paul is consciously applying, as Worthington seems to imply, the principle of Gen 5:3, a text which bears a lot of weight in Worthington's analysis of the image concept; cf. *Creation in Paul and Philo*, 199–200.

151 John G. Gibbs, *Creation and Redemption: A Study in Pauline Theology*, NovTSup 26 (Leiden: Brill, 1971), 140. This does not receive sufficient emphasis by Hahne, who is generally lukewarm to suggestions that corruption characterized creation from the start. Contributing to this is his heavy focus on the context of apocalyptic literature and light focus on the context of Paul's letters themselves; cf., e.g., Hahne, *Corruption*, 186–87, 192, 194–96: “The perishable bodies of believers [citing 1 Cor 15:42–43] are part of the perishable material creation that is enslaved to corruptibility” (198).

152 Cf. Gibbs: “Redemption presupposes creation because redemption is no threat to the creation but, rather, carries to fulfillment what was provided as possibility in the creation”; *Creation and Redemption*, 142.

153 “The ‘futility’ of creation indicates that it is not able to achieve the purpose for which it was created”; Hahne, *Corruption*, 211.

Finally, some perspective may be given to the logic which undergirds a scheme that appears to take for granted the inevitability of sin and ruin. While it is beyond the scope of this study to do anything more than provide the barest sketch, it would be ineffective to do anything less. There are two prongs to the perspective, which can be gleaned from Paul's discussion in Rom 8 and beyond. We find the hint of the first prong in Paul's statement that creation is subjected "in hope" (v. 20). Paul is confident that history is unfolding according to the designs of God, and that any "sufferings" which are corollary to that plan "are not worth comparing with the glory about to be revealed" (v. 18). He outright rejects any attempt to charge God with injustice if this plan involves "vessels of wrath fitted for destruction" (9:19–24). And if God has "imprisoned all in disobedience so that he may be merciful to all" (11:32), that is a matter "of the depth of the riches and wisdom and knowledge of God," whose judgments are unsearchable and whose ways inscrutable (11:32–33). He expresses his confidence in the triumph of God's purpose in 8:28; this is expounded in v. 29 as predestination of those God foreknew to conformation to the image of Christ. God's plan all along has been to see (elect) humanity through to Christ. There is a clear sense then of the sovereignty of God who acts as a conductor over the ebb and flow of a multifarious and often oblique existence.

But there is a second prong, a sort of indirect rationality that appears to be at work in Paul's thought, and it stands in some tension with the first. If conformation to the image of Christ is predestined, then a certain givenness attaches to all which leads up to it, good and bad.¹⁵⁴ But precisely why should all this have been necessary? Why not create humanity in this perfected sense from the start? An answer suggests itself when Paul says that "we are . . . heirs . . . *if, in fact, we suffer with him* so that we may also be glorified" (Rom 8:17). Everywhere in Paul's thought, the human being is treated as a willing, responsible agent (but certainly never "free" outside of redemption), with whom God would enter into personal relationship. God does not circumvent this relationship. "We also boast in our sufferings," Paul says, "knowing that suffering produces endurance and endurance produces character, and character produces hope, and hope does not disappoint us" (5:3–5). The whole creation is designed to facilitate this process, which is why it has been subjected—subjected, by design, to Adam prior to his disobedience, and subjected to decay because of his disobedience. According to the myth, God has *from the beginning* treated human beings as relational beings who have the opportunity for growth and

¹⁵⁴ Cf. Gibbs: "If God chose us in him before the foundation of the world (Eph 1:3), redemption is not the reflex of a God who was caught by surprise when sin entered the world"; *Creation and Redemption*, 140.

maturation, which must come from experience. Where traditions of Adam's supernatural status develop, this dimension of the portrayal of the divine-human relationship is short-circuited. In his classic work, *Evil and the God of Love*, John Hick recovered this relational construal of God and creation and concluded that "instead of upholding the perfection of the universe as an aesthetic whole, we must think of it as perfect in the rather different sense that it is suited to the fulfillment of God's purpose for it."¹⁵⁵ Here is the root of the tension between these poles in Paul's thought. He assumes the human being is morally accountable, even innocent in the least affected conditions (i.e., the twilight of creation and early childhood), but his particular understanding of God's purpose for creation as conformation to the heavenly image of Christ introduced by retrospection a strong element of fatalism and pessimism into his anthropology which is reflected in his interpretation of Gen 2–3. If God relates to humankind as moral beings, and yet it is only in conformation to the image of Christ that they reach maturity and God's purposes are fulfilled, then the picture of humanity outside of Christ will look bleak indeed.¹⁵⁶

One final trail along an admittedly speculative line. In his paean to the unsearchable depths of God's plan, Paul appears to cite Job 41:3 (מִי הָקֵדָה יָמֵי עֲשָׂה, E: 41:11) in Rom 11:35 (ἢ τίς προέδωκεν αὐτῷ, καὶ ἀνταποδοθήσεται αὐτῷ;). It is surprising that in his deliberations concerning the condemnation of humankind before God, Paul does not draw more on the radical dismissal of human righteousness before God on the part of Job's friends (Job 4:17–20; 15:14–16; 25:4–6), but now Paul approaches a similar point: "Or who has given a gift to him, to receive a gift in return?" (Rom 11:35). Paul appeals here to the radical priority of God, as one against whom no one can claim a debt. God owes nothing to his creation, "for from him and through him and to him are all things" (Rom 11:36). Both in Romans and Job the statement (cited in v. 35) comes in the context of the assertion of God's radical plan and the futility on the part of a mere human to challenge God's justice. But there is more to the story, for both texts have wrestled profoundly with the problem of evil and suffering within the context of God's creation. The perspective offered in Job is important for the manner that it coalesces at points with the two prongs to Paul's perspective on evil, sin, and suffering sketched above.¹⁵⁷

155 John Hick, *Evil and the God of Love*, rev. ed. (New York: Harper & Row, 1978), 196.

156 Readers will recognize this as a variation on the familiar theme that for Paul solution precedes plight.

157 My thinking on Job has been shaped profoundly by the following authors: Carol A. Newsom, *The Book of Job: A Contest of Moral Imaginations* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003); eadem, *Job*; André Lacocque, "Job and the Symbolism of Evil," *BR* 24 (1980): 7–19, and his

As God leads Job through a tour of creation, two unsettling realities emerge. On the one hand, and primarily in the first speech from the whirlwind, God shakes Job free from his anthropocentrism: Job is without knowledge of creation's deep workings and fine design and the creation itself is depicted as showing little knowledge of and radical indifference to the contingencies and needs of humankind. On the other hand, and even more unsettling, in the second speech, the element of the chaotic to human well-being becomes central and God's relationship to such symbols subverts anthropocentric celebrations of God's good ordering of creation: "From the striking metaphor of the sea as swaddled infant, to the celebration of the wildness of those creatures who mock and spurn human control, to the ecstatic description of Leviathan, the uncomfortable sense grows that God's identification with the chaotic is as strong as with the symbols of order." As Carol Newsom proceeds to note, here "the nonmoral and nonrational aspects of deity are highlighted."¹⁵⁸ However, it is in this very context that God challenges Job to take up the tasks which are fitting of one to whom God has given dominion over creation (40:6–13).¹⁵⁹ If we take these thoughts back to the story-world of the opening chapters of Job, which can be read as a folk-tale variation on the myth of Gen 2–3, their relevance becomes unmistakable.¹⁶⁰ Into the idyllic innocence of Job's well-ordered world, God sends the agent of chaos to test him: Is Job really so upright, so close to God? How can that be known in a perfectly comfortable world? The tale can be read as a parable of the plan and risks God takes in creation in order to be relationally involved with humanity.¹⁶¹

several articles on Job; J. Gerald Janzen, "Creation and the Human Predicament in Job," *ExAud* 3 (1987): 45–53; idem, *Job*, Interpretation (Atlanta: Westminster John Knox Press, 1985).

158 Newsom, *Moral Imaginations*, 252.

159 For the view suggested here that the questions and challenges God poses to Job are ironic, designed not ultimately to debase but to invite him to re-imagine human vocation in the world, cf. Janzen, *Job*; similarly, now, Samuel Eugene Balentine, *Job* (Macon, GA: Smyth & Helwys Publishers, 2006). Against this, cf. Leo G. Perdue, *Wisdom Literature: A Theological History* (Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 2007), 118–27; idem, *Wisdom in Revolt: Metaphorical Theology in the Book of Job* (Sheffield: Almond Press, 1991), 196–236.

160 This step in my interpretation, it should be noted, sits uncomfortably with Carol's Newsom's description of the "polyphonic" author's desire to set divergent voices in dialogue, without ever intending to privilege one above the others: "The Book of Job as Polyphonic Text," *JSOT* 97 (2002): 87–108; eadem, *Moral Imaginations*.

161 The influence of Gen 1–3 on the early chapters of Job has been noted by many; cf. David Shepherd, "'Strike His Bone and His Flesh': Reading Job from the Beginning," *JSOT* 33 (2008): 81–97; Robert Sutherland, *Putting God on Trial: The Biblical Book of Job*

Bringing this back to Paul, it is apparent that he shares elements of this perspective. In the very allusion he makes to Hebrew Job, it is not clear whether God or Leviathan speaks; at the very least, the text occurs in the midst of God's celebration of the fierce creature.¹⁶² This serves to underscore the frankness in each about the occurrence of *anomia* (or in Newsom's words, "God's identification with the chaotic") as well as their mutual assertion of God's certain and unsearchable ("irrational") wisdom, even while both also assume a profoundly relational construal of God and *adam*. There is much to learn from Job that can throw light on Paul's thoughts concerning creation, sin, and suffering. At the same time, the Christ-event lends an element of determinism and tension to Paul's thought which is not reflected in the open-endedness and polyvalence of the Joban narrative. In the light of the eschatological events of God's salvific intervention through the death and resurrection of Christ, Paul has dived head-long into a perspective into which Job's friends waded only knee-deep. In the trial of innocence, has humankind been found to be capable of righteousness? Paul's answer is unequivocal: No, not one. Ironically, Paul came to make that claim a bedrock of his thinking as a reflex to the discovery of what he believed to be the one exception to the rule.

(Victoria, BC: Trafford, 2004); Sam Meier, "Job 1–2: A Reflection of Genesis 1–3," *VT* 39 (1989): 183–93; Michael Fishbane, "Jeremiah 4:23–6 and Job 3:3–13: A Recovered Use of the Creation Pattern," *VT* 21 (1971): 151–67.

162 Cf. Newsom, *Job*, 622–23.

Conclusions on Paul

I draw my conclusions on Paul into two separate discussions. In the first, I discuss the relationship between the two parts of the investigation into Paul, seeking to define the different emphases that emerged from each, how they might be related, and why they might have arisen. In the second, I filter the results of this entire study on Paul through the three questions which we also posed to the Hodayot's use of anthropogonic traditions.

Romans and the Rest

Our study of anthropogonic traditions in Galatians, 1 and 2 Corinthians, and Philippians found that Paul assumes for the present the normative status and continuous operation of creaturely ontologies established in creation, including, and especially, the somatic condition of the image of God in humanity. At the same time, he anticipates assimilation to the image of God on the model of the heavenly image of the resurrected Christ. This eschatological hope was typologically conveyed in the creation of the world, both in the dualism of heaven and earth and in the creation of Adam's *psychikos* body, indicating that the present order of creation is also in a condition of incompleteness. For this reason, he anticipates the transcendence of aspects of the created order which were inherent in it from the beginning, prior to any negative causation arising from human disobedience, such as the asymmetrical relationship to the image of God established in the creation of "male and female." He understands the fulfillment of creation to have been contingent on the successful completion of humankind's commission to rule as God's royal representatives. This task has fallen on Christ, who divests himself of his heavenly glory, takes on the image of Adam, undoes the disobedience of man and woman, and becomes in his resurrection the new Adam, who pacifies creation and becomes head of a new humanity conformed to his heavenly image. This conformation begins now in the continuous making new of the inner person through the spirit, the mark and guarantor of the heavenly existence.

Far from contradicting this picture, Romans fills it out by focusing on the deleterious consequences of human straying. The failing of Adam has cosmic consequences because the creation, including Adam's own body, is open, responsive, and dependent on the human vocation to carry forward God's

creative intentions. The reign of death and the subjection to futility follow from Adam's disobedience. Interrelated tensions of myth and history, fate and responsibility are found in Paul's use of the creation narrative of Gen 2–3 especially. Adam fails and the human prospect is seemingly derailed. But Adam's failure is in the truest sense, a *human* failing. Adam does not fall from glory. Adam simply does as *adams* do in their natural condition, and thereby forfeit glory. This is why in failing and preventing the fulfillment of creation Adam subjects humankind to condemnation, for he passes on his creaturely mortality, corruptibility, and susceptibility to passions arising in the flesh, exposed by his encounter with divine law. The element of fate in this original failing is increased for ordinary humanity by the negative causality of Adam's sin on the cosmic order, allowing for inherently chaotic elements to rise from the sea, as it were. Only Christ can correct this condition, he who has been the goal of creation all along. Paul is not thinking philosophically and abstractly in all of this; he is filtering his tradition through convictions which he has arrived at not by a process of detached reasoning but on the basis of his experience of God's salvation in Christ. At the same time, since such traditions have for Paul a kind of normative status, they simultaneously inform the character and positive content of his understanding of salvation. Adam is not simply a foil for Christ.

The different emphases between "Romans and the rest" can be comprehended largely as a product of the varied aspects under which anthropogonic traditions are called upon in each. In Galatians, Corinthians, and Philippians such traditions are drawn into the discussion usually at places where they inform aspects of the argument related to conditions of the body *per se* (partial and nearly complete exceptions occur in 2 Cor 3:18 and 1 Cor 15:20–28, respectively)—hence the prominence of the category of the image of God in these discussions. In Romans anthropogonic traditions are more thoroughly integrated into the discussion to illuminate the total condition of the person, material and moral-vocational.

Anthropogony and Theology in Paul

From the above comparison, the deficiencies of the paradigm of creation-fall-restoration are evident. Adam is no stranger; rather, he is all too human for Paul. His sin represents a sort of derailling of creation but not because it began from a point of completion but rather because it was open and responsive and not yet complete. Even still, Adam passes on his original condition to ordinary humanity. And the salvation that Paul sees as inaugurated in Christ includes

the undoing of aspects of that original creation as the earthly and the heavenly duality are finally in the process of being overcome in Christ. I now summarize the findings of our chapters on Paul under the three rubrics (or questions) which we set out to explore from the first.

What is the purpose and destiny of humankind as relayed in association with traditions of creation? The destiny of humankind was not given to it in creation, and creation does not define the scope of salvation. The destiny of humankind is to be conformed to the heavenly image of Christ. Its purpose is to grow up into Christ and bring God's order to a world which was made to be responsive to and dependent on human causation for the full flourishing of God's purposes. Creation is and always has been the dynamic stage on which these purposes unfold.

How is human creatureliness evaluated from the perspective of this purpose; is humanity innately equipped to fulfill it? Paul can view the creatureliness of humankind from two angles. On the one hand, he can think of it as an effect of the creative agency of God. Here he has in mind its material goodness and integrity. Human beings are the earthly image of God, a condition which is at least partly somatically determined and therefore differently instantiated in men and women. This aspect of his thought is important and not sufficiently appreciated, but it does perhaps constitute a narrowed focus on material conditions *per se*, which is less than a full accounting of human creatureliness. On the other hand, then, he also thinks of humankind from a moral-vocational standpoint of the whole person. When he thinks of the body from this aspect, he emphasizes its enslavement to sin, its constitutional susceptibility to being overrun by passions, and the impotence of human will to do the good which would amount to human flourishing as God intends. That Paul has not abandoned the first perspective becomes apparent in the manner that he refrains from characterizing the body, and even flesh, as evil in itself and in the way he can insist on adherence to norms that accord to the body. Original humanity is separated from this condition not absolutely, because of some aesthetic state of perfection, nor by some supernatural endowment, but by the relational conceptuality, as best as can be surmised, of innocence and immaturity—categories which in fact Paul seems to apply to ordinary humans in their time of youth. Inasmuch as humankind is predestined to be conformed to the heavenly image of Christ, who in his resurrection life fulfills the *adamic* commission, Paul simply “knows” that the earthly human being does not have the resources to fulfill the human commission and bring creation into its intended fullness.

Finally, what means are provided within the mythology of creation to comprehend negative evaluations of human creatureliness? Creation in the

image of God seems to portend both humankind's destiny and its limitations. The heavenly prototype of the earthly image borne by Adam and his descendants anticipates the ultimate hope or destiny of humankind. On the other hand, the earthly image of Adam seems ill-equipped to carry out its commission because it comes too easily under the influence of inchoately chaotic powers. The typological element within creation itself, however, together in the signs of God's creative power therein, the duality of heaven and earth, the anticipation of the heavenly image in the earthly, and the very history of Adam himself, supplies Paul with confidence in the overarching intelligence and sovereignty of God in history.

Conclusions

The present study has sought to re-evaluate the framework within which the use of anthropogonic traditions in the Hodayot and the letters of Paul is best comprehended. The reigning paradigm which continues to shape scholars' interpretation of the use of such traditions in these corpora is that of creation, fall, and restoration. Although its short-comings, including an element of anachronism, have been widely acknowledged, the continuing influence of the paradigm can be seen for instance in the reconstruction of a widespread hypothesis that original humanity had lost its divine glory or lost or tarnished the image of God, leading to the belief that either or both must be *restored*. As a result, too little notice has been paid when this literature problematizes *original*, and not merely "fallen"—or better "ordinary"—humanity, its sexuality, its earthly physicality, its spiritual-moral frailty. In what follows, then, I briefly summarize the Hodayot's and Paul's handling of anthropogonic traditions, after which I point to additional areas of contribution this study makes to scholarship and where it calls for further research.

Theology and Traditions of Anthropogony

This study found that in the Hodayot the "glory of *adam*" focuses as much on the conditions Adam enjoyed as on a material property of Adam's and that when Adam's materiality is in fact in view it is regarded as the chief obstacle to the elect's enjoyment of the heavenly and immortal life. While a picture of an exalted humanity in the Hodayot can be traced to the influence of Gen 1:26–27 and Ps 8 partly through related traditions in the Treatise on the Two Spirits and in 4QInstruction, the focus here is present and future oriented. Moreover, when these psalms turn to express why the elect are ill-suited and unfit for the communion to which they are called they look directly back to Gen 2:6–7 and take up Joban motifs, including the traditional equation of the earth and the womb, in order to deconstruct the spiritual-moral integrity of the *adam*-of-dust and to characterize this creature as innately impure and even abhorrent.

For his part, the apostle Paul shows no knowledge of the loss of glory or of the image of God. In the conformation to the image of Christ, the image of God is neither restored nor repaired, but rather assimilated to its heavenly model, which Paul detects in the creation after the image in Gen 1:26–27. At the same

time, the human image of Gen 1:26–27 is read harmonistically with the creation from dust and ensuing events of Gen 2–3. Paul draws on the very created nature of Adam and Eve, and not some fallen version of them, in order to reinforce the innate corruptibility of the earthly image, the asymmetry of male and female as expressions of the image, and the archetypal and inevitable failure of earthly humankind to achieve with its own resources the completion of its commission to bring order to creation or to arrive at the immortality which is intended for it.

The paradigm of creation-fall-restoration, then, does not adequately account for the manner that both the Hodayot and the apostle Paul exegete ordinary human nature through original human nature as well as anticipate the transformation of what constitutes human nature in creation. While creation in the image of God portends the heavenly destiny of the elect and the transcendence of the earthly ontology of the human being, creation from dust and even the inbreathing of the spirit are given a thoroughly naturalistic interpretation, signifying humanity's participation in the same plane of nature as the animals. Thus while Gen 1:26–27 is drawn into the orbit of motifs of the heavenly calling and transformation of humanity, Gen 2:6–7 becomes associated with motifs of innate corruption and problematics of human sexuality. Rather than make use of the concept of a fall to comprehend their pessimistic accounts of the human being, in both the Hodayot and Paul pessimistic accounts of the human being explain the expulsion from Eden and whatever that setting was thought to entail. In both sets of literature one rather finds an emphasis on the divine plan and determinism, modulated, especially in Paul, by elements of a relational construal of God, humanity, and the cosmos.

The Hodayot: Implications for Scholarship

This study of the Hodayot has highlighted its tremendous indebtedness to the book of Job. Generally, the disavowal of any significant human claim to righteousness in Job has profoundly shaped the Hodayot. This is reflected in the use of uniquely and particularly Joban expressions and especially in adopting a distinctly Joban version of self-abasement formula inspired by Ps 8. The emphasis on this form-critical category advances the discussion of the *Niedrigkeitsdoxologien*, which are typically considered in the framework of *Gerichtsdoxologie*. However, they often most closely resemble the anthropological variations of self-abasement and insult formula found in Ps 8 and the book of Job. Another particularly striking occurrence of Job's influence on the Hodayot is felt in 1QH^a XX–XXI, where the treatment of Job's concluding

response to the theophanic confrontation in Aramaic Job (11Q10) provides a model on which the *Maskil* anticipates his own experience before God, the righteous judge. Job's importance may extend beyond the Hodayot and be more fundamental to the distinctive writings of the Qumran caves than has hitherto been recognized. A full study might shed more light on these documents.

Another area in which this study has broader significance is in the comprehension of purity and eschatology among the sectarians. While scholars discuss the relationship between ritual and moral purity in the distinctive texts of the Qumran Scrolls, the emphasis in the Hodayot upon participation in an eternal and otherworldly communion should perhaps be given more attention, as it puts in sharp relief the human inadequacies for and obstacles to such communion. Ritual purifications can only secure a temporary and always fraught participation in the heavenly priesthood, with such limitations keenly impressing upon the earthly worshiper the sense of being out-of-place among the divine beings. This perspective might generate or, perhaps rather, *aggravate* a negative moral evaluation of innate ritual-sexual impurity and physical corruption, thus contributing to the collapse of categories of ritual and moral purity in this milieu. Such dissatisfaction with innate impurity would seem to have less to do with a community's alienation from the temple and limited means of ritual purifications than with its experience of the radically other, something which exposes it as different and undesirable, an experience which might be had through some kind of mystical communion with or ascension to heaven. Such experiences might shape an eschatology which looks even beyond the messianic period (when ritual purifications remain necessary) to the ultimate communion between heaven and earth. Thus a hope for the eclipse of the earthly ontology of the worshiper in order to fully experience communion with the heavenly world seems also to inform and give shape to a concept of deification in the Hodayot. Therefore, a sense of eschatological anticipation is to be expected, for these psalms express the perception that the innate impurity that stems from creation from the earth remains a persistent obstacle to the attainment of all the glory of *adam*.

Finally, there may be implications here for the question of whether celibacy was practiced among some of the sectarians. As these authors celebrate being drawn into direct communion with the divine-heavenly world, they use rhetoric of self-abasement that draws on the innate sexuality of the earth-born Adam and Eve to characterize their own sexed body as an object of shame: "from dust you took me and from clay I was shaped as a spring of [sexual] impurity and shameful nakedness" (1QH^a XX 27–28, author trans.). The symbolic logic that marks creation from the earth as a sign of (shameful) impurity rests on the metaphorical equation of the earth and the womb. The use

of language of innate sexual impurity in self-deprecatory rhetoric might then be related both to the sense of being out-of-place in the heavenly world and a preference for abstaining from sexual activity in order to limit its negative impact upon one's ability to experience such a world. These texts should have a place in discussions concerned with the question of celibacy and the identity of the communities behind these scrolls.

The Apostle Paul: Implications for Scholarship

Whereas scholarship concerned with anthropogony in Paul's letters tends to go down the path of one of two directions—either filter Paul's statements through the grid of fall and restoration or assert that, except as a foil for Christ, he cared little about Adam—this study has found a different route. Paul is less affected by the dogmatic and systematic tendencies that sometimes undergird the two standard options and is more open to the narratives of Genesis than is often realized. In a manner similar to the Hodayot, Paul complicates the picture of humanity not through a doctrine of the fall but rather under the pressure of a sense of the divine plan and a concept of an exalted destiny that is set in contrast to original humanity. At the same time, Paul also appears to be influenced by elements within Gen 1–3 itself which suggest a highly relational construal of Adam and creation. Adam is conceived as a moral subject, whose growth requires testing; he is therefore incomplete or immature, which is why he stands under the commandment (so also in Philo). This can be mapped on to the concept of the image of God. Creation *in* the image of God determines the bodies of Adam and his descendants—and relates differently to males and females—but it also reflects the duality of heaven and earth and thus the possibility of growth as the assimilation of the corruptible earthly image to its incorruptible heavenly counterpart. The story of Eden then is still one of a lost chance of immortality and a trial of innocence rather than a fall from some supernatural condition, a state of maturity or completion. There are resonances here with the second century church father Irenaeus which are generally overlooked. Further investigations along these lines should continue to add to and refine our understanding of the nature of anthropogony in the letters of Paul.

Paul's constructive use of the natural world as a theological category was unforeseen at the outset of this study and much of scholarship appears to share this oversight. Paul, for the most part, assumes the continuous operation and normative status of creaturely ontologies established in creation. This study found, most strikingly, that he believes in the continuous and normative

significance of humankind's creation in the image of God, and he often reasons with the aid of insights he believes are entailed in the natural world, which on analogy to the human body, continues to bear the imprint of its Creator. Instead, scholarship usually tells us that Paul has a profoundly negative, apocalyptic view of the corruption of nature and its pervasion by sin, but the validity of these insights will depend on their ability to comprehend the more constructive functions of creation in his thought. Despite the undeniable presence of such an apocalyptic worldview in 1QS we found similar thinking about creation there, and in the *Hodayot* as well. Perhaps the negative impact of death on the hermeneutical-theological value of the created world is mitigated when God's creative act is not thought to have bequeathed some static condition of ontic perfection which has been spoiled by humanity. Paul's most negative statements about creation, including the human body, are made when it is viewed not as material reality but under the perspective of a spiritual, moral aspect. It is an important insight that Paul seems capable of separating the two.

Finally, this study has had many opportunities to wrestle with the relationship of the categories of participation and forensic thought in Paul. Paul's thinking reflects the appearance of these very categories in Gen 1–3. The category of participation is relayed in the dynamic ontology of creation and emblematically in the tree of life, while the forensic category decisively shapes the narrative through the introduction of the commandment. Abstractly, the dynamic between these categories adds a tension and ambiguity to the narrative that is directly comparable to Paul's thought. Concretely, the integrity of the forensic category in Paul's thinking is supported inasmuch as he recognizes it as an archetypal element in the conflicted relationship between God and humanity. Moreover, the element of participation is hereby naturally related to the discourse of deification, as some contemporary scholarship is pointing out, since that issue is inscribed into the question of what it is to be human in Gen 1–3 itself, as well as the eighth Psalm. The scholarly debate concerning the relationship of forensic and participatory frameworks in Paul's thought might, then, be fruitfully addressed by looking at the tension between these two tendencies of thought within Paul's own traditions.

Bibliography

- Aasgaard, Reidar. "Paul as a Child: Children and Childhood in the Letters of the Apostle." *JBL* 126 (2007): 129–59.
- Abegg, Martin G. "Who Ascended to Heaven: 4Q491, 4Q427, and the Teacher of Righteousness." Pages 61–73 in *Eschatology, Messianism, and the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Edited by Craig A. Evans and Peter W. Flint. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1997.
- Adams, Edward. *Constructing the World: A Study in Paul's Cosmological Language*. SNTW. Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 2000.
- . "Paul's Story of God and Creation: The Story of How God Fulfills His Purposes in Creation." Pages 19–43 in *Narrative Dynamics in Paul: A Critical Assessment*. Edited by Bruce W. Longenecker. London: Westminster John Knox, 2002.
- Alexander, Philip S. *Mystical Texts*. ECDSS. London: T & T Clark, 2006.
- . "Predestination and Free Will in the Theology of the Dead Sea Scrolls." Pages 27–49 in *Divine and Human Agency in Paul and His Cultural Environment*. Edited by John M. G. Barclay and Simon J. Gathercole. London: T & T Clark, 2008.
- . "Qumran and the Genealogy of Western Mysticism." Pages 215–35 in *New Perspectives on Old Texts: Proceedings of the Tenth International Symposium of the Orion Center for the Study of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Associated Literature, 9–11 January, 2005*. Edited by Esther G. Chazon, Betsy Halpern Amaru, and Ruth Clements. STDJ 88. Leiden: Brill, 2010.
- Alexander, Philip S., and Géza Vermès, eds. *Qumran Cave 4.XIX: 4QSerekh Ha-Yahad and Two Related Texts*. DJD xxvi. Oxford: Clarendon, 1998.
- Angel, Joseph L. *Otherworldly and Eschatological Priesthood in the Dead Sea Scrolls*. STDJ 86. Leiden: Brill, 2010.
- . "The Liturgical-Eschatological Priest of the Self-Glorification Hymn." *RevQ* 96 (2010): 585–605.
- Antonissen, H. "Die weisheitliche Terminologie in den 'Hodayot': ein kontextbezogener Überblick." *Leqach* 7 (2007): 1–15.
- Asher, Jeffrey R. *Polarity and Change in 1 Corinthians 15: A Study of Metaphysics, Rhetoric, and Resurrection*. HUT 42. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2000.
- . "Speiretai: Anthropogenic Metaphor in 1 Corinthians 15:42–44." *JBL* 120 (2001): 101–22.
- Baillet, M., ed. *Qumrân Grotte 4.III (4Q482–4Q520)*. DJD vii. Oxford: Clarendon, 1982.
- Balentine, Samuel Eugene. *Job*. Macon, GA: Smyth & Helwys Publishers, 2006.
- Barclay, John M. G. "Paul, the Gift and the Battle over Gentile Circumcision: Revisiting the Logic of Galatians." *ABR* 58 (2010): 36–56.
- . *Paul and the Gift*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2015.

- Bardtke, Hans. "Considérations sur les cantiques de Qumrân." *RB* 63 (1956): 220–33.
- Barrett, C. K. *From First Adam to Last: A Study in Pauline Theology*. London: Black, 1962.
- . *The Epistle to the Romans*. Rev. ed. BNTC. London: Black, 1991.
- . *A Commentary on the First Epistle to the Corinthians*. 2nd ed. BNTC. New York: Harper & Row, 1992.
- Barth, Karl. *Christ and Adam: Man and Humanity in Romans 5*. New York: Harper & Bros, 1957.
- Barthélemy, D. and J. T. Milik. *Qumran Cave 1. DJD 1*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1955.
- Batsch, Christophe. "Les cantiques d'ascension de Qumrân (4QSelf-Glorification) et le ravissement de Paul (2 Corinthiens 12)." *Hen* 34 (2012): 314–30.
- Bauckham, Richard. *God Crucified: Monotheism and Christology in the New Testament*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998.
- . "The Story of the Earth according to Paul: Romans 8:18–23." *RevExp* 108 (2011): 91–97.
- Beale, Gregory K., and Donald A. Carson, eds. *Commentary on the New Testament Use of the Old Testament*. Grand Rapids: Baker, 2007.
- Becker, Jürgen. *Das Heil Gottes: Heils- und Sündenbegriffe in Qumran und im Neuen Testament*. SUNT 3. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1964.
- Beker, Johan Christiaan. *Paul the Apostle: The Triumph of God in Life and Thought*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1984.
- Bell, Richard H. "The Myth of Adam and the Myth of Christ in Romans 5.12–21." Pages 21–36 in *Paul, Luke and the Graeco-Roman World: Essays in Honour of Alexander J. M. Wedderburn*. Edited by Alf Christophersen, Carsten Claussen, Jörg Frey, and Bruce W. Longenecker. JSNTSup 217. London: T & T Clark, 2003.
- . *Deliver Us from Evil: Interpreting the Redemption from the Power of Satan in New Testament Theology*. WUNT 216. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2007.
- Belleville, Linda L. "'Under Law': Structural Analysis and the Pauline Concept of Law in Galatians 3:21–4:11." *JSNT* 26 (1986): 53–78.
- . *Reflections of Glory: Paul's Polemical Use of the Moses-Doxa Tradition in 2 Corinthians 3:1–18*. JSNTSup 52. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1991.
- Berg, Shane. "Religious Epistemologies in the Dead Sea Scrolls: The Heritage and Transformation of the Wisdom Tradition." PhD diss., Yale University, 2009.
- Berger, Peter L. *The Sacred Canopy: Elements of a Sociological Theory of Religion*. Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1969.
- Betz, Hans Dieter. *Galatians: A Commentary on Paul's Letter to the Churches in Galatia*. Hermeneia. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1979.
- Bird, Phyllis A. "'Male and Female He Created Them': Gen 1:27b in the Context of the Priestly Creation Account." *HTR* 74 (1981): 129–59.

- . "Sexual Differentiation and Divine Image in the Genesis Creation Texts." Pages 11–34 in *Image of God and Gender Models in Judaeo-Christian Tradition*. Edited by Kari Elisabeth Børresen. Oslo: Solum Forlag, 1991.
- Black, Matthew. "The Pauline Doctrine of the Second Adam." *SJT* 7 (1954): 170–79.
- . "Pasai Exousiai Autō Hypotagēsontai." Pages 74–82 in *Paul and Paulinism*. London: SPCK, 1982.
- Blackwell, Benjamin C. "Immortal Glory and the Problem of Death in Romans 3.23." *JSNT* 32 (2010): 285–308.
- . *Christosis: Pauline Soteriology in Light of Deification in Irenaeus and Cyril of Alexandria*. WUNT 314. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2011.
- Bockmuehl, Markus N. A. *Revelation and Mystery in Ancient Judaism and Pauline Christianity*. WUNT 36. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1990.
- . "'The Form of God' (Phil 2:6): Variations on a Theme of Jewish Mysticism." *JTS* 48 (1997): 1–23.
- . *The Epistle to the Philippians*. BNTC. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publishers, 1998.
- Boda, Mark J. *Praying the Tradition*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1999.
- Boer, Martinus C. de. *The Defeat of Death: Apocalyptic Eschatology in 1 Corinthians 15 and Romans 5*. JSNTSup 22. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1988.
- . *Galatians: A Commentary*. Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 2011.
- Børresen, Kari Elisabeth. "God's Image, Is Woman Excluded? Medieval Interpretation of Gen 1,27 and 1 Cor 11,7." Pages 208–27 in *Image of God and Gender Models in Judaeo-Christian Tradition*. Edited by Kari Elisabeth Børresen. Oslo: Solum Forlag, 1991.
- . "God's Image, Man's Image? Patristic Interpretation of Gen 1,27 and 1 Cor 11,7." Pages 188–207 in *Image of God and Gender Models in Judaeo-Christian Tradition*. Edited by Kari Elisabeth Børresen. Oslo: Solum Forlag, 1991.
- Boucher, Madeleine. "Some Unexplored Parallels to 1 Cor 11:11–12 and Gal 3:28: The NT on the Role of Women." *CBQ* 31 (1969): 50–58.
- Boyarín, Daniel. *A Radical Jew: Paul the Politics of Identity*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1994.
- . "Gender." Pages 117–35 in *Critical Terms for Religious Studies*. Edited by Mark C. Taylor. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1998.
- Braaten, Laurie J. "The Groaning Creation: The Biblical Background for Romans 8:22." *BR* 50 (2005): 19–39.
- Brand, Miryam T. *Evil Within and Without: The Source of Sin and Its Nature as Portrayed in Second Temple Literature*. Journal of Ancient Judaism. Supplements 9. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2013.

- Brandenburger, Egon. *Adam und Christus: exegetisch-religions-geschichtliche Untersuchung zu Röm. 5,12–21 (1.Kor 15)*. WMANT 7. Neukirchen: Neukirchener Verlag, 1962.
- Braun, Herbert. "Römer 7,7–25 und das Selbstverständnis des Qumran-Frommen." *ZTK* 56 (1959): 1–18.
- Bray, Gerald L., ed. *1–2 Corinthians*. ACCS. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 2006.
- Brooke, George J. "Miqdash Adam, Eden and the Qumran Community." Pages 285–301 in *Gemeinde Ohne Tempel*. Edited by Beatte Ego, Armin Lange, and Kathrin Ehlers. WUNT 118. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1999.
- Bruce, F. F. *The Letter of Paul the Apostle to the Romans: An Introduction and Commentary*. TNTC. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1985.
- Bultmann, Rudolf. "Adam und Christus nach Rom 5." *ZNW* 50 (1959): 145–65.
- . "Adam and Christ according to Romans 5." Pages 143–65 in *Current Issues in New Testament Interpretation*. Edited by W. Klassen and G. F. Snyder. San Francisco: Harper, 1962.
- . "Romans 7 and the Anthropology of Paul." Pages 147–57 in *Existence and Faith: Shorter Writings of Rudolf Bultmann*. Living Age Books. New York: Meridian Books, 1966.
- . *Theology of the New Testament*. Repr. Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2007.
- Burney, C. F. "Christ as the APXH of Creation." *JTS* 27 (1925): 160–77.
- Burrows, Millar, ed. *The Dead Sea Scrolls of St. Mark's Monastery*. New Haven, CT: The American Schools of Oriental Research, 1951.
- Busch, Austin. "The Figure of Eve in Romans 7:5–25." *BiblInt* 12 (2004): 1–36.
- Byrne, Brendan J. *Sons of God, Seed of Abraham: A Study of the Idea of the Sonship of God of All Christians in Paul against the Jewish Background*. AnBib 83. Rome: Biblical Institute, 1979.
- Caebel, Jean de. "La connaissance religieuse dans les Hymnes d'action de grâces de Qumrân." *ETL* 38 (1962): 435–60.
- Caird, G. B. *Principalities and Powers: A Study in Pauline Theology*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1956.
- Calef, Susan A. "Kephale, Coverings, and Cosmology: The Impenetrable 'Logic' of 1 Corinthians 11:2–16." *JRSSup* 5 (2009): 21–44.
- Campbell, D. H. "The Identity of ἐγώ in Romans 7:7–25." Pages 57–64 in *Studia Biblica III*. Sheffield: JSOT, 1980.
- Campbell, Douglas A. *The Deliverance of God: An Apocalyptic Rereading of Justification in Paul*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2009.
- Carmignac, Jean. "Conjecture sur la première ligne de la Règle de la Communauté." *RevQ* 2 (1959): 85–87.
- . "Les citations de l'Ancient Testament, et spécialement des Poèmes du Serviteur, dans les Hymnes de Qumrân." *RevQ* 2 (1960): 357–94.
- . "La théologie de la souffrance dans les hymnes de Qumrân." *RevQ* 3 (1961): 365–86.

- Carr, Wesley. *Angels and Principalities: The Pauline Phrase hai archai kai hai exousiai*. SNTSMS 42. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1981.
- Casimir, Brother. "When (the Father) Will Subject All Things to (the Son): A Treatise on 1 Corinthians 15:28 by Saint Gregory of Nyssa." *Greek Orthodox Theological Review* 28 (1983): 1–25.
- Cerfaux, L. "Hymne au Christ—Serviteur de Dieu (Phil., II, 6–11 = Is., LII, 13–LIII, 12)." Pages 425–37 in *Recueil Lucien Cerfaux: études d'exégèse et d'histoire religieuse de Monsieur Cerfaux réunies à l'occasion de son soixante-dixième anniversaire*. Vol. 2. BETL 6–7. Gembloux: Duculot, 1954.
- Charlesworth, James H., ed. *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*. 2 Vols. ABRL. New York: Doubleday, 1983–1985.
- . "An Allegorical and Autobiographical Poem by the Moreh Ha-Sedeq (1QH 8:4–11)." Pages 295–307 in *"Sha'arei Talmon": Studies in the Bible, Qumran, and the Ancient Near East Presented to Shemaryahu Talmon*. Edited by Shemaryahu Talmon, Michael A. Fishbane, Emanuel Tov, and Weston W. Fields. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1992.
- , ed. *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Texts with English Translations. Volume 1, Rule of the Community and Related Documents*. PTSDSSP. Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 1994.
- Chazon, E., T. Elgvin, Daniel K. Falk, Bilhah Nitzan, Elisha Qimron, Eileen Schuller, David Seely, Eibert Tigchelaar, and Moshe Weinfeld, eds. *Qumran Cave 4.XX: Poetical and Liturgical Texts, Part 2*. DJD XXIX. Oxford: Clarendon, 1999.
- Chazon, Esther. "Human and Angelic Prayer in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls." Pages 35–47 in *Liturgical Perspectives: Prayer and Poetry in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls, Proceedings of the Fifth International Symposium of the Orion Center for the Study of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Associated Literature, 19–23 January, 2000*. Edited by E. Chazon. STDJ 48. Leiden: Brill, 2003.
- . "Liturgical Function in the Cave 1 Hodayot Collection." Pages 135–52 in *Qumran Cave 1 Revisited: Texts from Cave 1 Sixty Years after Their Discovery: Proceedings of the Sixth Meeting of the IQS in Ljubljana*. Edited by Sarianna Metso, Donald W. Parry, and Eibert J. C. Tigchelaar. STDJ 91. Leiden: Brill, 2010.
- . "Tradition and Innovation in Sectarian Religious Poetry." Pages 55–68 in *Prayer and Poetry in the Dead Sea Scrolls and Related Literature: Essays in Honor of Eileen Schuller on the Occasion of Her 65th Birthday*. Edited by Jeremy Penner, Ken M. Penner, and Cecilia Wassen. STDJ 98. Leiden: Brill, 2012.
- . "Lowly to Lofty: The Hodayot's Use of Liturgical Traditions to Shape Sectarian Identity and Religious Experience." *RevQ* 26 (2013): 3–19.
- Chester, Stephen J. *Conversion at Corinth: Perspectives on Conversion in Paul's Theology and the Corinthian Church*. SNTW. London: T & T Clark, 2005.
- Christoffersson, Olle. *The Earnest Expectation of the Creature: The Flood-Tradition as Matrix of Romans 8:18–27*. CBNT 23. Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell, 1990.

- Ciampa, Roy E., and Brian S. Rosner. *The First Letter to the Corinthians*. PNTC. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2010.
- Clines, David J. A. "Humanity as the Image of God." *TynBul* 19 (1968): 53–103.
- . *Job 1–20*. WBC. Nashville: Word Books, 1989.
- . *What Does Eve Do To Help? And Other Readerly Questions to the Old Testament*. London: T & T Clark, 1990.
- Coats, George W. "Self-Abasement and Insult Formulas." *JBL* 89 (1970): 14–26.
- Collins, John J. *Daniel*. Hermeneia. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1993.
- . "A Throne in the Heavens: Apotheosis in Pre-Christian Judaism." Pages 43–58 in *Death, Ecstasy, and Other Worldly Journeys*. Edited by John J. Collins and Michael A. Fishbane. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press, 1995.
- . *Apocalypticism in the Dead Sea Scrolls*. London: Routledge, 1997.
- . "In the Likeness of the Holy Ones: The Creation of Humankind in a Wisdom Text from Qumran." Pages 609–18 in *Provo International Conference on the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Edited by Donald W. Parry and Eugene Ulrich. STDJ 30. Leiden: Brill, 1999.
- . "Interpretations of the Creation of Humanity in the Dead Sea Scrolls." Pages 29–43 in *Biblical Interpretation at Qumran*. Edited by Matthias Henze. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2005.
- . "Beyond the Qumran Community: Social Organization in the Dead Sea Scrolls." *DSD* 16 (2009): 351–69.
- . "The Angelic Life." Pages 291–310 in *Metamorphoses: Resurrection, Body and Transformative Practices in Early Christianity*. Edited by Turid Karlsen Seim and Jorunn Økland. Ekstasis 1. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2009.
- . *Beyond the Qumran Community: The Sectarian Movement of the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2010.
- . *The Scepter and the Star: Messianism in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls*. 2nd ed. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2010.
- Collins, Raymond F. *First Corinthians*. SP. Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1999.
- Conzelmann, Hans. *1 Corinthians*. Translated by James W. Leitch. Hermeneia. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1975.
- Cousar, Charles B. *Philippians and Philemon: A Commentary*. NTL. Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 2009.
- Cox, Ronald. *By the Same Word: Creation and Salvation in Hellenistic Judaism and Early Christianity*. BZNW 145. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2007.
- Cranfield, C. E. B. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans*. ICC. London: T & T Clark, 1975.
- Crenshaw, James L. *Hymnic Affirmation of Divine Justice*. Missoula, MN: Scholars Press for the Society of Biblical Literature, 1975.
- Crossan, John Dominic, and Jonathan L. Reed. *In Search of Paul: How Jesus' Apostle Opposed Rome's Empire with God's Kingdom*. San Francisco: HarperCollins, 2005.

- Crouch, Carly L. "Genesis 1:26–7 as a Statement of Humanity's Divine Parentage." *JTS* 61 (2010): 1–15.
- Dahl, N. A. "Christ, Creation and the Church." Pages 422–33 in *The Background of the New Testament and Its Eschatology*. Edited by W. D. Davies and David Daube. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1964.
- Daise, Michael A. "Biblical Creation Motifs in the Qumran Hodayot." Pages 293–305 in *Dead Sea Scrolls: Fifty Years after Their Discovery: Proceedings of the Jerusalem Congress, July 20–25, 1997*. Edited by Lawrence H. Schiffman, Emmanuel Tov, James VanderKam, and Galen Marquis. Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 2000.
- D'Angelo, Mary Rose. "The Garden: Once and Not Again: Traditional Interpretations of Genesis 1:26–27 in 1 Corinthians 11:7–12." Pages 1–41 in *Genesis 1–3 in the History of Exegesis*. Lewiston, NY: Edwin Mellen Press, 1988.
- . "Gender Refusers in the Early Christian Mission: Gal 3:28 as an Interpretation of Gen 1:27b." Pages 149–73 in *Reading in Christian Communities: Essays on Interpretation in the Early Church*. Edited by Charles A. Bobertz and David Brakke. Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press, 2002.
- Das, A. Andrew. *Solving the Romans Debate*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2007.
- Davidson, Maxwell J. *Angels at Qumran: A Comparative Study of 1 Enoch 1–36, 72–108 and Sectarian Writings from Qumran*. London: T & T Clark, 1992.
- Davies, Philip R. "History and Hagiography: The Life of the 'Teacher' in Hymn and Peshet." Pages 87–105 in *Behind the Essenes: History and Ideology in the Dead Sea Scrolls*. BJS 94. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1987.
- Davies, W. D. "Paul and the Dead Sea Scrolls: Flesh and Spirit." Pages 157–82 in *The Scrolls and the New Testament*. Edited by Krister Stendahl. Repr. New York: Crossroad, 1992.
- Davila, James R. *Liturgical Works*. ECDSS. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000.
- Dietzel, Armin. "Beten im Geist: eine religionsgeschichtliche Parallele aus den Hodayot zum paulinischen Gebet im Geist." *TZ* 13 (1957): 12–32.
- Dimant, Devorah. "A Synoptic Comparison of Parallel Sections in 4Q427 7, 4Q491 11 and 4Q471B." *JQR* 85 (1994): 157–61.
- . "Men as Angels: The Self-Image of the Qumran Community." Pages 93–103 in *Religion and Politics in the Ancient Near East*. Edited by Adele Berlin. Bethesda, MD: University Press of Maryland, 1996.
- Doble, Peter. "'Vile Bodies' or Transformed Persons? Philippians 3.21 in Context." *JSNT* 86 (2002): 3–27.
- Dodd, Brian. *Paul's Paradigmatic "I": Personal Example as Literary Strategy*. JSNTSup 177. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1999.
- Douglas, Michael C. "Power and Praise in the Hodayot: A Literary Critical Study of 1QH 9:1–18:14." PhD diss., The University of Chicago, 1997.
- . "The Teacher Hymn Hypothesis Revisited: New Data for an Old Crux." *DSD* 6 (1999): 239–66.

- Duff, Paul Brooks. "Transformed 'from Glory to Glory': Paul's Appeal to the Experience of His Readers in 2 Corinthians 3:18." *JBL* 127 (2008): 759–80.
- Duhaime, Jean. "Instruction sur les deux esprits et les interpolations dualistes a Qumrân (1QS III, 13–IV, 26)." *RB* 84 (1977): 566–94.
- . "Cohérence structurelle et tensions internes dans l'Instruction sur les Deux Esprits (1QS III 13–IV 26)." Pages 103–31 in *Wisdom and Apocalypticism in the Dead Sea Scrolls and in the Biblical Tradition*. Edited by Florentino García Martínez. ETL 168. Leuven: Peeters, 2003.
- Dunn, James D. G. "2 Corinthians 3:17: The Lord Is the Spirit." *JTS* 21 (1970): 309–20.
- . *The Epistle to the Galatians*. BNTC. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1993.
- . *Christology in the Making: A New Testament Inquiry into the Origins of the Doctrine of the Incarnation*. 2nd ed. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1996.
- . *The Epistles to the Colossians and to Philemon: A Commentary on the Greek Text*. NIGTC. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1996.
- . "Christ, Adam, and Preexistence." Pages 74–83 in *Where Christology Began*. Edited by Ralph P. Martin and Brian J. Dodd. Louisville, KY: Westminster, 1998.
- . *Romans*. WBC. Dallas: Word Books, 1988.
- . "How Are the Dead Raised? With What Body Do They Come? Reflections on 1 Corinthians 15." *SwJT* 45 (2002): 4–18.
- . *The Theology of Paul the Apostle*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2006.
- . "Adam in Paul." Pages 120–35 in *The Pseudepigrapha and Christian Origins: Essays from the Studiorum Novi Testamenti Societas*. Edited by Gerbern S. Oegema and James H. Charlesworth. New York: T & T Clark, 2008.
- Dunning, Benjamin H. *Specters of Paul: Sexual Difference in Early Christian Thought*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2011.
- Eastman, Susan Grove. "Whose Apocalypse? The Identity of the Sons of God in Romans 8:19." *JBL* 121 (2002): 263–77.
- Ellis, E. Earle. *Paul's Use of the Old Testament*. Edinburgh: Oliver and Boyd, 1957.
- Eltester, Friedrich Wilhelm. *Eikon im Neuen Testament*. BZNW 23. Berlin: A Töppelmann, 1958.
- Elwolde, John F. "Interrogatives in the Hodayot: Some Preliminary Observations." Pages 129–51 in *Hamlet on a Hill: Semitic and Greek Studies Presented to Professor T. Muraoka on the Occasion of His Sixty-Fifth Birthday*. OLA 118. Leuven: Peeters, 2003.
- Enderlein, Steven E. "To Fall Short or Lack the Glory of God? The Translation and Implications of Romans 3:23." *JSPL* 1 (2011): 213–24.
- Engberg-Pedersen, Troels. *Cosmology and Self in the Apostle Paul: The Material Spirit*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010.
- Eriksson, Anders. "Elaboration of Argument in 1 Cor 15:20–34." *SEÅ* 64 (1999): 101–14.

- Eskola, Timo. *Theodicy and Predestination in Pauline Soteriology*. WUNT 2/100. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1998.
- Esler, Philip Francis. *Conflict and Identity in Romans: The Social Setting of Paul's Letter*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2003.
- Fatum, Lone. "Image of God and Glory of Man': Women in the Pauline Congregations." Pages 56–137 in *Image of God and Gender Models in Judaeo-Christian Tradition*. Edited by Kari Elisabeth Børresen. Oslo: Solum Forlag, 1991.
- Feder, Yitzhaq. "Contagion and Cognition: Bodily Experience and the Conceptualization of Pollution (ṭum'ah) in the Hebrew Bible." *JNES* 72 (2013): 151–67.
- Fee, Gordon D. *The First Epistle to the Corinthians*. NICNT. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1987.
- . *Pauline Christology: An Exegetical-Theological Study*. Grand Rapids: Baker, 2007.
- Feinstein, Eve Levavi. *Sexual Pollution in the Hebrew Bible*. New York: Oxford, 2014.
- Feuillet, A. "Homme 'gloire de Dieu' et la femme 'gloire de l'homme.'" *RB* 81 (1974): 161–82.
- . "La dignité et le rôle de la femme d'après quelques textes pauliniens: comparaison avec l'Ancien Testament." *NTS* 21 (1975): 157–91.
- Finlan, Stephen. "Can We Speak of Theosis in Paul?" Pages 68–80 in *Partakers of the Divine Nature*. Edited by Michael J. Christensen and Jeffery A. Wittung. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2008.
- Fishbane, Michael. "Jeremiah 4:23–6 and Job 3:3–13: A Recovered Use of the Creation Pattern." *VT* 21 (1971): 151–67.
- Fitzmyer, Joseph A. "A Feature of Qumran Angelology and the Angels of 1 Cor 11:10." *NTS* 4 (1957): 48–58.
- . "Some Observations on the Targum of Job from Qumran Cave 11." *CBQ* 36 (1974): 503–24.
- . "Glory Reflected on the Face of Christ (2 Cor 3:7–4:6) and a Palestinian Jewish Motif." *TS* 42 (1981): 630–44.
- . *Romans*. AB. New York: Doubleday, 1993.
- . "The Consecutive Meaning of ἐφ' ᾧ Romans 5:12." *NTS* 39 (1993): 321–39.
- . *First Corinthians: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*. AB. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2008.
- Fletcher-Louis, Crispin H. T. *All the Glory of Adam: Liturgical Anthropology in the Dead Sea Scrolls*. STDJ 42. Leiden: Brill, 2002.
- Fossum, Jarl. "Jewish-Christian Christology and Jewish Mysticism." *VC* 37 (1983): 260–87.
- Fowl, Stephen E. *Philippians*. THNTC. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2005.
- Fredrickson, David E. "God, Christ, and All Things in 1 Corinthians 15:28." *WW* 18 (1998): 254–63.

- Frennesson, Björn. *In a Common Rejoicing: Liturgical Communion with Angels in Qumran*. Uppsala: Uppsala University, 1999.
- Frey, Jörg. "Different Patterns of Dualistic Thought in the Qumran Library: Reflections on Their Background and History." Pages 275–335 in *Legal Texts and Legal Issues: Proceedings of the Second Meeting of the International Organization for Qumran Studies, Cambridge, 1995: Published in Honour of Joseph M. Baumgarten*. Edited by Joseph M. Baumgarten, Moshe J. Bernstein, Florentino García Martínez, and John Kampen. STDJ 23. Leiden: Brill, 1997.
- . "Die paulinische Antithese von 'Fleisch' und 'Geist' und die palästinisch-jüdische Weisheitstradition." *ZNW* 90 (1999): 45–77.
- . "The Notion of 'Flesh' in 4QInstruction and the Background of Pauline Usage." Pages 197–226 in *Sapiential, Liturgical and Poetical Texts from Qumran*. Edited by F. García Martínez. STDJ 35. Leiden: Brill, 2000.
- . "Flesh and Spirit in the Palestinian Jewish Sapiential Tradition and in the Qumran Texts: An Inquiry into the Background of Pauline Usage." Pages 367–404 in *The Wisdom Texts from Qumran and the Development of Sapiential Thought*. Edited by Charlotte Hempel, Armin Lange, and Hermann Lichtenberger. BETL 159. Leuven: Peeters, 2002.
- García Martínez, Florentino. "Old Texts and Modern Mirages: The 'I' of Two Qumran Hymns." *ETL* 78 (2002): 321–39.
- . "Creation in the Dead Sea Scrolls." Pages 219–40 in *Qumranica Minora*. Edited by Florentino García Martínez and Eibert J. C. Tigchelaar. STDJ 64. Leiden: Brill, 2007.
- García Martínez, Florentino, and Eibert J. C. Tigchelaar. *The Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition*. 2 vols. Leiden: Brill, 1997.
- García Martínez, Florentino, Eibert J. C. Tigchelaar, and A. S. van der Woude, eds. *Qumran Cave 11.II: (11Q2–18, 11Q20–31)*. DJD XXIII. Oxford: Clarendon, 1998.
- Garland, David E. *1 Corinthians*. BECNT. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2003.
- Gibbs, John G. *Creation and Redemption: A Study in Pauline Theology*. NovTSup 26. Leiden: Brill, 1971.
- Gieschen, Charles A. *Angelomorphic Christology: Antecedents and Early Evidence*. AGJU 42. Leiden: Brill, 1998.
- Gladd, Benjamin L. "The Last Adam as the 'Life-Giving Spirit' Revisited: A Possible Old Testament Background of One of Paul's Most Perplexing Phrases." *WTJ* 71 (2009): 297–309.
- Goff, Matthew J. *The Worldly and Heavenly Wisdom of 4QInstruction*. STDJ 50. Leiden: Brill, 2003.
- . "Reading Wisdom at Qumran: 4QInstruction and the Hodayot." *DSD* 11 (2004): 263–88.

- . *Discerning Wisdom: The Sapiential Literature of the Dead Sea Scrolls*. VTSup 116. Leiden: Brill, 2007.
- Goldingay, John. *Old Testament Theology*. 3 vols. Downers Grove, IL: Inter-Varsity Press, 2003.
- Gordley, Matthew E. "Creation Imagery in Qumran Hymns and Prayers." *JJS* 59 (2008): 252–72.
- . *Teaching through Song in Antiquity*. WUNT 302. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2011.
- Gorman, Michael J. "'Although/Because He Was in the Form of God': The Theological Significance of Paul's Master Story (Phil 2:6–11)." *JTS* 1 (2007): 147–70.
- . *Inhabiting the Cruciform God: Kenosis, Justification, and Theosis in Paul's Narrative Soteriology*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2009.
- . "Romans: The First Christian Treatise on Theosis." *JTI* 5 (2011): 14–34.
- Greenfield, Jonas C. "Root GBL in Mishnaic Hebrew and in the Hymnic Literature from Qumran." *RevQ* 2 (1959): 155–62.
- Greer, Rowan A. "Sinned We All in Adam's Fall." Pages 382–94 in *The Social World of the First Christians: Essays in Honour of Wayne A. Meeks*. Edited by L. Michael White and O. Larry Yarbrough. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1995.
- Grundmann, Walter. "Der Lehrer der Gerechtigkeit von Qumran und die Frage nach der Glaubensgerechtigkeit in der Theologie des Apostels Paulus." *RevQ* 6 (1960): 237–59.
- . "The Teacher of Righteousness of Qumran and the Question of Justification by Faith in the Theology of the Apostle Paul." Pages 85–114 in *Paul and Qumran*. Edited by Jerome Murphy-O'Connor. London: Geoffrey Chapman, 1968.
- Gundry, Robert H. "The Moral Frustration of Paul before His Conversion: Sexual Lust in Romans 7:7–25." Pages 252–71 in *The Old Is Better: New Testament Essays in Support of Traditional Interpretations*. WUNT 178. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2005.
- Gundry-Volf, Judith M. "Male and Female in Creation and New Creation: Interpretations of Galatians 3:28c in 1 Corinthians 7." Pages 95–121 in *To Tell the Mystery: Essays on New Testament Eschatology in Honor of Robert H. Gundry*. Edited by Thomas E. Schmidt and Moisés Silva. Sheffield: JSOT, 1994.
- . "Christ and Gender: A Study of Difference and Equality in Gal 3,28." Pages 439–77 in *Jesus Christus als die Mitte der Schrift: Studien zur Hermeneutik des Evangeliums*. Edited by Christof Landmesser, Hans-Joachim Eckstein, and Hermann Lichtenberger. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1997.
- . "Gender and Creation in 1 Cor 11:2–16: A Study in Paul's Theological Method." Pages 151–71 in *Evangelium, Schriftauslegung, Kirche: Festschrift für Peter Stuhlmacher zum 65 Geburtstag*. Edited by Jostein Ådna, Scott J. Hafemann, Otfried Hofius, and Gerlinde Feine. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1997.

- Gunkel, Hermann. *Genesis*. Translated by Mark E. Biddle. Macon, GA: Mercer University Press, 1997.
- Gupta, Nijay. "To Whom Was Christ a Slave (Phil 2:7)? Double Agency and the Specters of Sin and Death in Philippians." *HBT* 32 (2010): 1–16.
- Haber, Susan. *"They Shall Purify Themselves": Essays on Purity in Early Judaism*. Edited by Adele Reinhartz. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2008.
- Habermann, Jürgen. *Präexistenzaussagen im Neuen Testament*. Europäische Hochschulschriften. Frankfurt: Peter Lang, 1990.
- Hafemann, Scott J. *Paul, Moses, and the History of Israel: The Letter/Spirit Contrast and the Argument from Scripture in 2 Corinthians 3*. WUNT 81. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1995.
- Hahne, Harry. *The Corruption and Redemption of Creation: Nature in Romans 8.19–22 and Jewish Apocalyptic Literature*. LNTS 336. New York: T & T Clark, 2006.
- Hanson, Anthony T. "The Midrash in 2 Corinthians 3: A Reconsideration." *JSNT* 9 (1980): 2–28.
- Harkins, Angela Kim. "The Community Hymns Classification: A Proposal for Further Differentiation." *DSD* 15 (2008): 121–54.
- . "A New Proposal for Thinking about 1QHa Sixty Years after Its Discovery." Pages 101–34 in *Qumran Cave 1 Revisited: Texts from Cave 1 Sixty Years After Their Discovery: Proceedings of the Sixth Meeting of the 10QS in Ljubljana*. Edited by Sarianna Metso, Donald W. Parry, and Eibert J. C. Tigchelaar. STDJ 91. Leiden: Brill, 2010.
- . "Reading the Qumran Hodayot in the Light of Traditions Associated with Enoch." *Hen* 32 (2010): 1–42.
- . "The Performative Reading of the Hodayot: The Arousal of Emotions and the Exegetical Generation of Texts." *JSP* 21 (2011): 55–71.
- . *Reading with an "I" to the Heavens: Looking at the Qumran Hodayot through the Lens of Visionary Traditions*. Ekstasis 3. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2012.
- . "Who Is the Teacher of the Teacher Hymns? Re-Examining the Teacher Hymns Hypothesis Fifty Years Later." Pages 449–67 in *A Teacher for All Generations: Essays in Honor of James C. VanderKam*. Edited by Eric Mason, Samuel I. Thomas, Alison Schofield, and Eugene Ulrich. Vol. 1. SJSJ 153. Leiden: Brill, 2012.
- Harrington, Hannah K. *The Purity Texts*. Companion to the Qumran Scrolls. Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 2004.
- Harris, Murray J. *The Second Epistle to the Corinthians: A Commentary on the Greek Text*. NIGTC. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2005.
- Hasselbalch, Trine Bjørnung. *Meaning and Context in the Thanksgiving Hymns: Linguistic and Rhetorical Perspectives on a Collection of Prayers from Qumran*. EJL 42. Atlanta: SBL Press, 2015.
- Hawthorne, Gerald F. "In the Form of God and Equal with God (Philippians 2:6)." Pages 96–110 in *Where Christology Began*. Edited by Ralph P. Martin and Brian J. Dodd. Louisville, KY: Westminster, 1998.

- Hawthorne, Gerald F., Ralph P. Martin, and Daniel G. Reid, eds. *Dictionary of Paul and His Letters*. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 1993.
- Hay, David M. *Glory at the Right Hand: Psalm 110 in Early Christianity*. SBLMS 18. Nashville: Abingdon, 1973.
- . *Colossians*. ANTC. Abingdon Press, 2011.
- Hays, Richard B. *Echoes of Scripture in the Letters of Paul*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1989.
- . *First Corinthians*. IBC. Louisville, KY: Westminster, 1997.
- Heger, Paul. *Challenges to Conventional Opinions on Qumran and Enoch Issues*. STDJ 100. Leiden: Brill, 2012.
- . "Celibacy in Qumran—Hellenistic Fiction or Reality? Qumran's Attitude toward Sex." *RevQ* 26 (2013): 53–90.
- Heil, John Paul. *The Rhetorical Role of Scripture in 1 Corinthians*. Studies in Biblical Literature. Leiden: Brill, 2005.
- . *Colossians: Encouragement to Walk in All Wisdom as Holy Ones in Christ*. Atlanta: SBL, 2010.
- Heil, Uta. "Theologische Interpretation von 1Kor 15,23–28." *ZNW* 84 (1993): 27–35.
- Hempel, Charlotte. "Maskil(im) and Rabbim: From Daniel to Qumran." Pages 133–56 in *Biblical Traditions in Transmission: Essays in Honour of Michael A. Knibb*. Edited by Charlotte Hempel and Judith Lieu. JSJSup 111. Leiden: Brill, 2006.
- Herring, Stephen L. "A 'Transubstantiated' Humanity: The Relationship between the Divine Image and the Presence of God in Genesis 1 26f." *VT* 58 (2008): 480–94.
- Hick, John. *Evil and the God of Love*. Rev. ed. New York: Harper & Row, 1978.
- Hill, C. E. "Paul's Understanding of Christ's Kingdom in 1 Corinthians 15:20–28." *NovT* 30 (1988): 297–320.
- Hincks, Edward Young. "The Meaning of the Phrase Ta Stoicheia Tou Kosmou in Gal. iv. 3 and Col. ii. 8." *JBL* 15 (1896): 183–92.
- Hofius, Otfried. *Der Christushymnus Philipper 2:6–11: Untersuchungen zur Gestalt und Aussage eines urchristlichen Psalms*. WUNT 2/17. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1991.
- . "The Adam-Christ Antithesis and the Law: Reflections on Romans 5:12–21." Pages 165–206 in *Paul and the Mosaic Law*. Edited by J. D. G. Dunn. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 2001.
- Hogan, Pauline Nigh. *No Longer Male and Female: Interpreting Galatians 3:28 in Early Christianity*. LNTS 380. London: T & T Clark, 2008.
- Holm-Nielsen, Svend. *Hodayot: Psalms from Qumran*. Aarhus: Universitetsforlaget, 1960.
- Hooker, Morna D. "Adam in Romans 1." *NTS* 6 (1960): 297–306.
- . "Authority on Her Head: An Examination of 1 Cor 11:10." *NTS* 10 (1964): 410–16.
- . *From Adam to Christ: Essays on Paul*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990.

- Hoover, Roy W. "The Harpagmos Enigma: A Philological Solution." *HTR* 64 (1971): 95–119.
- Horst, F. "Die Doxologien im Amosbuch." *ZAW* 47 (1929): 45–54.
- Howard, George. "Phil 2:6–11 and the Human Christ." *CBQ* 40 (1978): 368–87.
- Hübner, Hans. "Anthropologischer Dualismus in den Hodayot?" *NTS* 18 (1972): 268–84.
- Hughes, Julie A. *Scriptural Allusions and Exegesis in the Hodayot*. STDJ 59. Leiden: Brill, 2006.
- Hultgård, Anders. "God and Image of Woman in Early Jewish Religion." Pages 35–55 in *Image of God and Gender Models in Judaeo-Christian Tradition*. Edited by Kari Elisabeth Børresen. Oslo: Solum Forlag, 1991.
- Hultgren, Arland J. *Paul's Letter to the Romans: A Commentary*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2011.
- Hultgren, Stephen J. "The Origin of Paul's Doctrine of the Two Adams in 1 Corinthians 15:45–49." *JSNT* 25 (2003): 343–70.
- . *From the Damascus Covenant to the Covenant of the Community: Literary, Historical, and Theological Studies in the Dead Sea Scrolls*. STDJ 66. Leiden: Brill, 2007.
- Huppenbauer, Hans Walter. "Bśr 'Fleisch' in den Texten von Qumran (Höhle 1)." *TZ* 13 (1957): 298–300.
- Hurtado, Larry W. "Jesus as Lordly Example in Phil 2:5–11." Pages 113–26 in *From Jesus to Paul: Studies in Honour of Francis Wright Beare*. Edited by Peter Richardson and John C. Hurd. Waterloo, ON: Wilfrid Laurier University Press, 1984.
- . *Lord Jesus Christ: Devotion to Jesus in Earliest Christianity*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2005.
- Hyatt, James Philip. "View of Man in the Qumran 'Hodayot.'" *NTS* 2 (1956): 276–84.
- Janzen, J. Gerald. *Job*. Interpretation. Atlanta: Westminster John Knox Press, 1985.
- . "Creation and the Human Predicament in Job." *ExAud* 3 (1987): 45–53.
- Jassen, Alex P. *Mediating the Divine: Prophecy and Revelation in the Dead Sea Scrolls and Second Temple Judaism*. STDJ 68. Leiden: Brill, 2007.
- Jeremias, Gert. *Der Lehrer der Gerechtigkeit*. SUNT 2. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1963.
- Jeremias, Joachim. "'Flesh and Blood Cannot Inherit the Kingdom of God' (1 Corinthians 15:50)." *NTS* 2 (1956): 151–59.
- . "Zu Phil 2:7: heauton ekenōsen." *NovT* 6 (1963): 182–88.
- Jervell, Jacob. *Imago Dei: Gen 1,26f im Spätjudentum, in der Gnosis und in den paulinischen Briefen*. FRLANT 76. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1960.
- Jervis, L. Ann. "'But I Want You to Know . . .': Paul's Midrashic Intertextual Response to the Corinthian Worshipers (1 Cor 11:2–16)." *JBL* 112 (1993): 231–46.
- Jewett, Robert. *Romans: A Commentary*. Hermeneia. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2007.

- Johnson, Andy. "Firstfruits and Death's Defeat: Metaphor in Paul's Rhetorical Strategy in 1 Cor 15:20–28." *WW* 16 (1996): 456–64.
- Josephus. Translated by Henry St. J. Thackeray et al. 10 vols. LCL. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1926–1965.
- Kahl, Brigitte. "No Longer Male: Masculinity Struggles behind Galatians 3:28?" *JSNT* 79 (2000): 37–49.
- Kampen, John. *Wisdom Literature*. ECDSS. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2011.
- Käsemann, Ernst. "Kritische Analyse von Phil 2:5–11." *ZTK* 47 (1950): 313–60.
- . "Critical Analysis of Philippians 2:5–11." *JTC* 5 (1968): 45–88.
- . *Commentary on Romans*. London: SCM Press, 1980.
- Kazen, Thomas. *Emotions in Biblical Law: A Cognitive Science Approach*. Hebrew Bible Monographs 36. Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix, 2011.
- Keck, Leander E. *Romans*. ANTC. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 2005.
- Keener, Craig S. *1–2 Corinthians*. NCBC. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005.
- Keesmaat, Sylvia C. "Exodus and the Intertextual Transformation of Tradition in Romans 8:14–30." *JSNT* 54 (1994): 29–56.
- . *Paul and His Story: (Re)-Interpreting the Exodus Tradition*. JSNTSup 181. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1999.
- Kim, Seyoon. *The Origin of Paul's Gospel*. 2nd ed. WUNT 4. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1984.
- Kirby, John T. "The Syntax of Romans 5:12: A Rhetorical Approach." *NTS* 33 (1987): 283–86.
- Kister, Menahem. "'First Adam' and 'Second Adam' in 1 Cor 15:45–49 in the Light of Midrashic Exegesis and Hebrew Usage." Pages 351–65 in *New Testament and Rabbinic Literature*. Edited by Reimund Bieringer, Florentino García Martínez, Didier Pollefeyt, and Peter J. Tomson. JSJSup 136. Leiden: Brill, 2010.
- Klawans, Jonathan. *Impurity and Sin in Ancient Judaism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000.
- . *Purity, Sacrifice, and the Temple: Symbolism and Supersessionism in the Study of Ancient Judaism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005.
- . "Purity in the Dead Sea Scrolls." Pages 377–402 in *The Oxford Handbook of the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Edited by Timothy H. Lim and John J. Collins. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010.
- Kooten, George H. van. *Paul's Anthropology in Context: The Image of God, Assimilation to God, and Tripartite Man in Ancient Judaism, Ancient Philosophy and Early Christianity*. WUNT 232. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008.
- Kosmala, Hans. *Hebräer, Essener, Christen: Studien zur Vorgeschichte der frühchristlichen Verkündigung*. StPB 1. Leiden: Brill, 1959.
- Kuhn, Heinz-Wolfgang. *Enderwartung und gegenwaertiges Heil*. SUNT 4. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1966.
- Kuhn, Karl G. "Peiramos-hamartia-sarx im Neuen Testament und die damit zusammenhängenden Vorstellungen." *ZTK* 49 (1952): 200–222.

- . "New Light on Temptation, Sin, and Flesh in the New Testament." Pages 94–113 in *The Scrolls and the New Testament*. Edited by Krister Stendahl. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 1957.
- Kümmel, Werner Georg. *Römer 7 und das Bild des Menschen im Neuen Testament*. Zürich: Zwingli-Verlag, 1948.
- . *Man in the New Testament*. London: Epworth Press, 1963.
- Kvalvaag, Robert W. "The Spirit in Human Beings in Some Qumran Non-Biblical Texts." Pages 159–80 in *Qumran between Old and New Testaments*. Edited by Frederick H. Cryer and Thomas L. Thompson. JSOTSup 290. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1998.
- Laato, Timo. *Paul and Judaism: An Anthropological Approach*. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1995.
- . "Paul's Anthropological Considerations: Two Problems." Pages 343–59 in *Justification and Variegated Nomism Volume 2, The Paradoxes of Paul*. Edited by Donald A. Carson, Peter Thomas O'Brien, and Mark A. Seifrid. Grand Rapids: Baker, 2004.
- Lacocque, André. "Job and the Symbolism of Evil." *BR* 24 (1980): 7–19.
- Lahey, Michael. *Image and Glory of God: 1 Corinthians 11:2–16 as a Case Study in Bible, Gender and Hermeneutics*. LNTS 418. London: T & T Clark, 2010.
- Lambrecht, Jan. "Paul's Christological Use of Scripture in 1 Cor. 15.20–28." *NTS* 82 (1982): 502–27.
- . "Transformation in 2 Cor 3:18." *Bib* 64 (1983): 243–54.
- . *The Wretched "I" and Its Liberation: Paul in Romans 7 and 8*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1992.
- . *Second Corinthians*. SP. Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1999.
- Lampe, G. W. H. "New Testament Doctrine of Ktisis." *Mid-Stream* 4 (1964): 71–83.
- Lange, Armin. *Weisheit und Prädestination: weisheitliche Urordnung und Prädestination in den Textfunden von Qumran*. STDJ 18. Leiden: Brill, 1995.
- . "Wisdom and Predestination in the Dead Sea Scrolls." *DSD* 2 (1995): 340–54.
- Laqueur, Thomas Walter. *Making Sex: Body and Gender from the Greeks to Freud*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1990.
- Lehtipuu, Outi. "'Flesh and Blood Cannot Inherit the Kingdom of God': The Transformation of the Flesh in the Early Christian Debates Concerning Resurrection." Pages 147–68 in *Metamorphoses: Resurrection, Body and Transformative Practices in Early Christianity*. Edited by Turid Karlsen Seim and Jorunn Økland. Ekstasis 1. New York: Walter de Gruyter, 2009.
- Lemos, Tracy M. "Where There Is Dirt Is There System? Revisiting Biblical Purity Constructions." *JSOT* 37 (2013): 265–94.
- Levison, John R. *Portraits of Adam in Early Judaism: From Sirach to 2 Baruch*. Sheffield: JSOT, 1988.

- . "Adam and Eve in Romans 1:18–25 and the Greek Life of Adam and Eve." *NTS* 50 (2004): 519–34.
- . "Two Spirits in Qumran Theology." Pages 169–94 in *The Bible and the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Edited by James Charlesworth. Vol. 2. Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2006.
- . *Filled with the Spirit*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2009.
- Lewis, Scott M. *So That God May Be All in All: The Apocalyptic Message of 1 Corinthians 15:12–34*. Rome: Gregorian University Press, 1998.
- Lichtenberger, Hermann. *Studien zum Menschenbild in Texten der Qumrangemeinde*. SUNT 15. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1980.
- . *Das Ich Adams und das Ich der Menschheit: Studien zum Menschenbild in Römer 7*. WUNT 164. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2004.
- Licht, J. "The Doctrine of the Thanksgiving Scroll." *IEJ* 6 (1956): 1–13, 89–101.
- . "An Analysis of the Treatise on the Two Spirits in DSD." Pages 88–99 in *Aspects of the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Edited by Chaim Rabin and Yigael Yadin. Jerusalem: Magnes Press, 1965.
- Lienhard, Joseph T. "The Exegesis of 1 Cor 15:24–28 from Marcellus of Ancyra to Theodoret of Cyrus." *VC* 37 (1983): 340–59.
- Lincoln, Andrew T. *Paradise Now and Not Yet: Studies in the Role of the Heavenly Dimension in Paul's Thought with Special Reference to His Eschatology*. SNTSMS 43. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1981.
- Litwa, M. David. "2 Corinthians 3:18 and Its Implications for Theosis." *JTI* 2 (2008): 117–34.
- . *We Are Being Transformed: Deification in Paul's Soteriology*. BZNW 187. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2012.
- Loader, William R. G. *The Septuagint, Sexuality, and the New Testament: Case Studies on the Impact of the LXX in Philo and the New Testament*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2004.
- . *The Dead Sea Scrolls on Sexuality: Attitudes towards Sexuality in Sectarian and Related Literature at Qumran*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2009.
- Lohmeyer, Ernst. *Kyrios Jesus: Eine Untersuchung Zur Phil. 2, 5–11*. 2nd. ed. SHAW 4. Heidelberg: C. Winter, 1961.
- Lohse, Eduard. *Colossians and Philemon*. Translated by William R. Poehlmann and Robert J. Karris. Hermeneia. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1971.
- Longenecker, Richard N. *Paul, Apostle of Liberty*. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1964.
- . *Galatians*. WBC. Dallas: Word, 1990.
- Lorenzen, Stefanie. *Das paulinische Eikon-Konzept: semantische Analysen zur Sapientia Salomonis, zu Philo und den Paulusbriefen*. WUNT 250. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008.
- Louth, Andrew. "The Place of Theosis in Orthodox Theology." Pages 32–44 in *Partakers of the Divine Nature: The History and Development of Deification in the Christian*

- Traditions*. Edited by Michael J. Christensen and Jeffery A. Wittung. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2008.
- Lyonnet, Stanislas. "L'histoire du salut selon le chapitre 7 de l'Épître aux Romains." *Bib* 43 (1962): 117–51.
- . "'Tu ne convoiteras pas' (Rom 7:7)." Pages 157–65 in *Neotestamentica et Patristica: eine Freundesgabe, Oscar Cullmann zu seinem 60 Geburtstag*. Edited by Willem Cornelis van Unnik. Leiden: Brill, 1962.
- Macaskill, Grant. "Paradise in the New Testament." Pages 64–81 in *Paradise in Antiquity: Jewish and Christian Views*. Edited by Markus N. A. Bockmuehl and Gedaliahu A. G. Stroumsa. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010.
- . *Union with Christ in the New Testament*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013.
- MacDonald, Dennis Ronald. *There Is No Male and Female: The Fate of a Dominical Saying in Paul and Gnosticism*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1987.
- MacDonald, Margaret Y. *Colossians and Ephesians*. SP. Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 2008.
- Maier, Gerhard. *Mensch und freier Wille*. WUNT 12. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1971.
- Mansoor, Menahem. *The Thanksgiving Hymns*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1961.
- Marcus, Joel. "The Evil Inclination in the Letters of Paul." *IBS* 8 (1986): 8–21.
- Martin, Dale B. *The Corinthian Body*. New Haven, CT: Yale Univ Press, 1995.
- . *Sex and the Single Savior: Gender and Sexuality in Biblical Interpretation*. Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox, 2006.
- Martin, Ralph P. *Carmen Christi: Phil 2:5–11 in Recent Interpretation and in the Setting of Early Christian Worship*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1983.
- Martini, Jerome Q. "An Examination of Paul's Apocalyptic Narrative in First Corinthians 15:20–28." *CTR* 8 (2011): 57–70.
- Martyn, J. Louis. *Galatians*. AB. New York: Doubleday, 1997.
- . *Theological Issues in the Letters of Paul*. SNTW. Nashville: Abingdon, 1997.
- Maston, Jason. *Divine and Human Agency in Second Temple Judaism: A Comparative Study*. WUNT 297. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2010.
- Matera, Frank J. *Galatians*. SP. Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1992.
- McCasland, S. Vernon. "'The Image of God' according to Paul." *JBL* 69 (1950): 85–100.
- McDonough, Sean M. *Christ as Creator: Origins of a New Testament Doctrine*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009.
- McGinn, Sheila E. "All Creation Groans in Labor: Paul's Theology of Creation in Romans 8:18–32." Pages 114–23 in *Earth, Wind, and Fire: Biblical and Theological Perspectives on Creation*. Edited by Barbara Ellen Bowe, Carol J. Dempsey, and Mary Margaret Pazdan. Minneapolis: Liturgical Press, 2004.
- Meadowcroft, T. J. *Aramaic Daniel and Greek Daniel: A Literary Comparison*. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1995.

- Meeks, Wayne A. "Image of the Androgyne: Some Uses of a Symbol in Earliest Christianity." *HR* 13 (1974): 165–208.
- . *In Search of the Early Christians*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2002.
- Meier, Sam. "Job 1–2: A Reflection of Genesis 1–3." *VT* 39 (1989): 183–93.
- Meiser, Martin. "Die paulischen Adamaussagen im Kontext frühjüdischer und frühchristlicher Literatur." Pages 376–401 in *Jüdische Schriften in ihrem antik-jüdischen und urchristlichen Kontext*. Edited by Hermann Lichtenberger and Gerbern S. Oegema. Studien zu den Jüdischen Schriften aus hellenistisch-römischer Zeit. Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus, 2002.
- Merrill, Eugene H. *Qumran and Predestination: A Theological Study of the Thanksgiving Hymns*. STDJ 8. Leiden: Brill, 1975.
- Mettinger, Tryggve N. D. "Abbild oder Urbild: 'Imago Dei' in traditionsgeschichtlicher Sicht." *ZAW* 86 (1974): 403–24.
- Metzger, Bruce Manning. *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament*. 2nd ed. Stuttgart: Deutsche Biblegesellschaft, 1994.
- Meyer, Nicholas A. "מגבל". Pages 570–72 in vol. 2 of *Theologisches Wörterbuch zu den Qumrantexten*. Edited by Heinz-Josef Fabry and Ulrich Dahmen. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 2013.
- . "תכמים". In vol. 3 of *Theologisches Wörterbuch zu den Qumrantexten*. Edited by Heinz-Josef Fabry and Ulrich Dahmen. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, forthcoming.
- Milgrom, Jacob. "The Alleged 'Hidden Light.'" Pages 41–44 in *The Idea of Biblical Interpretation: Essays in Honor of James L. Kugel*. Edited by Hindy Najman and Judith Hood Newman. JSJSup 83. Leiden: Brill, 2004.
- Miller, Eric. "The Self-Glorification Hymn Reexamined." *Hen* 31 (2009): 307–24.
- Montgomery, Eric. "A Stream from Eden: The Nature and Development of a Revelatory Tradition in the Dead Sea Scrolls." PhD diss., McMaster University, 2013.
- Moo, Douglas J. *The Epistle to the Romans*. NICNT. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1996.
- Moo, Jonathan. "Romans 8.19–22 and Isaiah's Cosmic Covenant." *NTS* 54 (2008): 74–89.
- Morissette, Rodolphe. "La citation du Psaume [8:7b] dans 1 Corinthiens." *ScEs* 24 (1972): 313–42.
- Murray-Jones, C. R. A. "Paradise Revisited (2 Cor 12:1–12): The Jewish Mystical Background of Paul's Apostolate." *HTR* 86 (1993): 265–92.
- Moule, C. F. D. *The Epistles to the Colossians and to Philemon*. CGTC. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1962.
- Mowinkel, Sigmund. "Some Remarks on Hodayot 39:5–20." *JBL* 75 (1956): 265–76.
- Muddiman, John. "Adam, the Type of the One to Come." *Theology* 87 (1984): 101–10.
- Muraoka, T. *A Greek-English Lexicon of the Septuagint*. Louvain: Peeters, 2009.
- Murphy, Roland E. "בִּסְר in the Qumran Literature and Sarks in the Epistle to the Romans." Pages 60–76 in *Sacra Pagina: Miscellanea Biblica Congressus Internationalis*

- Catholici de Re Biblica*. Edited by Joseph Coppens, A. Descamps, and E. Massaux. Gembloux: J. Duculot, 1959.
- Murphy-O'Connor, Jerome. "Christological Anthropology in Phil 2:6–11." *RB* 83 (1976): 25–50.
- . "Sex and Logic in 1 Corinthians 11:2–16." *CBQ* 42 (1980): 482–500.
- Newman, Carey C. *Paul's Glory-Christology: Tradition and Rhetoric*. NovTSup 69. Leiden: Brill, 1992.
- Newsom, Carol A. "Kenneth Burke Meets the Teacher of Righteousness: Rhetorical Strategies in the Hodayot and the Serek Ha-Yahad." Pages 121–31 in *Of Scribes and Scrolls*. Edited by Harold W. Attridge, John J. Collins, and Thomas H. Tobin. Lanham, MD: Univ Press of America, 1990.
- . "'Sectually Explicit' Literature from Qumran." Pages 167–87 in *The Hebrew Bible and Its Interpreters*. Edited by David N. Freedman, Baruch Halpern, and William H. Propp. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1990.
- . "The Sage in the Literature of Qumran: The Functions of the Maškîl." Pages 373–82 in *The Sage in Israel and the Ancient Near East*. Edited by John G. Gammie and Leo G. Perdue. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1990.
- . *Job*. NIB 4. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1996.
- . "The Book of Job as Polyphonic Text." *JSOT* 97 (2002): 87–108.
- . *The Book of Job: A Contest of Moral Imaginations*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003.
- . *The Self as Symbolic Space: Constructing Identity and Community at Qumran*. STDJ 52. Leiden: Brill, 2004.
- . "Pairing Research Questions and Theories of Genre: A Case Study of the Hodayot." *DSD* 17 (2010): 270–88.
- . "Flesh, Spirit, and the Indigenous Psychology of the Hodayot." Pages 339–54 in *Prayer and Poetry in the Dead Sea Scrolls and Related Literature: Essays in Honor of Eileen Schuller on the Occasion of Her 65th Birthday*. Edited by Jeremy Penner, Ken M. Penner, and Cecilia Wassen. STDJ 98. Leiden: Brill, 2012.
- . "Models of the Moral Self: Hebrew Bible and Second Temple Judaism." *JBL* 131 (2012): 5–25.
- Nickelsburg, George W. E. "The Qumranic Radicalizing and Anthropologizing of an Eschatological Tradition (1QH 4:29–40)." Pages 423–35 in *Ernten, Was Man Sät: Festschrift Für Klaus Koch Zu Seinem 65 Geburtstag*. Edited by D. R. Daniels, U. Glessmer, and M. Rösel. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1991.
- . "The Qumranic Transformation of a Cosmological and Eschatological Tradition (1QH 4:29–40)." Pages 649–59 in *Madrid Qumran Congress: Proceedings of the International Congress on the Dead Sea Scrolls, Madrid, 18–21 March 1991*. Edited by J. C. Trebolle Barrera and L. Vegas Montaner. Vol. 2. STDJ 11. Leiden: Brill, 1992.

- Nickelsburg, George W. E. and James C. VanderKam. *1 Enoch: The Hermeneia Translation*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2012.
- Nicolet-Anderson, Valérie. "Tools for a Kierkegaardian Reading of Paul: Can Kierkegaard Help Us Understand the Role of the Law in Romans 7:7–12?" Pages 247–76 in *Reading Romans with Contemporary Philosophers and Theologians*. Edited by D. Odell-Scott. New York: T & T Clark, 2007.
- Nitzan, Bilhah. *Qumran Prayer and Religious Poetry*. STDJ 12. Leiden: Brill, 1994.
- . "The Idea of Creation and Its Implications in Qumran Literature." Pages 240–64 in *Creation in Jewish and Christian Tradition*. Edited by Henning Graf Reventlow and Yair Hoffman. JSOTSup 319. London: Sheffield Academic Press, 2002.
- O'Brien, Peter Thomas. *The Epistle to the Philippians: A Commentary on the Greek Text*. NIGTC. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1991.
- Økland, Jorunn. *Women in Their Place: Paul and the Corinthian Discourse of Gender and Sanctuary Space*. JSNTSup 269. London: T & T Clark, 2005.
- O'Neill, John Cochrane. "Hoover on Harpagmos Reviewed, with a Modest Proposal Concerning Philippians 2:6." *HTR* 81 (1988): 445–49.
- Orlov, Andrei A. "Vested with Adam's Glory: Moses as the Luminous Counterpart of Adam in the Dead Sea Scrolls and the Macarian Homilies." Pages 327–43 in *From Apocalypticism to Merkabah Mysticism: Studies in the Slavonic Pseudepigrapha*. JSJSup 114. Leiden: Brill, 2007.
- Pate, C. Marvin. *Adam Christology as the Exegetical and Theological Substructure of 2 Corinthians 4:7–5:21*. Lanham, MD: University Press of America, 1991.
- Penna, Romano. "Adamic Christology and Anthropological Optimism in 1 Corinthians 15:45–49." Pages 1:206–31 in *Paul the Apostle: A Theological and Exegetical Study*. 2 vols. Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1996.
- Penner, Ken M. "Realized or Future Salvation in the Hodayot." *Journal of Biblical Studies* 2 (2002): 1–49.
- Perdue, Leo G. *Wisdom in Revolt: Metaphorical Theology in the Book of Job*. Sheffield: Almond Press, 1991.
- . *Wisdom Literature: A Theological History*. Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 2007.
- Perkins, PHEME. "Pauline Anthropology in Light of Nag Hammadi." *CBQ* 48 (1986): 512–22.
- . "Adam and Christ in the Pauline Epistles." Pages 128–51 in *Celebrating Paul: Festschrift in Honor of Jerome Murphy-O'Connor, O.P., and Joseph A. Fitzmyer, S.J.* Edited by Peter Spitaler. Washington, DC: Catholic Biblical Association of America, 2012.
- Philo*. Translated by F. H. Colson et al. 12 vols. LCL. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1929–1962.

- Ploeg, J. P. M. van der, and A. S. van der Woude, eds. *Le Targum de Job de La Grotte XI de Qumrân*. Leiden: Brill, 1971.
- Plummer, Alfred. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Second Epistle of St. Paul to the Corinthians*. ICC. New York: Scribner's, 1915.
- Pope, Marvin H. *Job*. 3rd ed. AB. Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1973.
- Price, Robert M. "Punished in Paradise (An Exegetical Theory on 2 Corinthians 12:1–10)." *JSNT* 7 (1980): 33–40.
- Puech, Émile. "Quelques aspects de la restauration du Rouleau des Hymnes (1QH)." *JJS* 39 (1988): 38–55.
- . "Un hymne essénien en partie retrouvé et les Béatitudes: 1QH v 12–vi 18 (=col. XIII–XIV 7) et 4QBéat." *RevQ* 13 (1988): 59–88.
- . *La croyance des Esséniens en la vie future: immortalité, résurrection, vie éternelle? Histoire d'une croyance dans le Judaïsme ancien, 2 v. Études bibliques*. Paris: J. Gabalda, 1993.
- . "L'hymne de la glorification du maître de 4Q431." Pages 377–408 in *Prayer and Poetry in the Dead Sea Scrolls and Related Literature: Essays in Honor of Eileen Schuller on the Occasion of Her 65th Birthday*. Edited by Jeremy Penner, Ken M. Penner, and Cecilia Wassen. STDJ 98. Leiden: Brill, 2012.
- Qimron, Elisha. *The Dead Sea Scrolls: The Hebrew Writings*. Jerusalem: Yad Ben-Zvi Press, 2010.
- Quispel, Gilles. "Ezekiel 1:26 in Jewish Mysticism and Gnosis." *VC* 34 (1980): 1–13.
- Rabens, Volker. *The Holy Spirit and Ethics in Paul: Transformation and Empowering for Religious-Ethical Life*. WUNT 283. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2010.
- Rad, G. von. "Gerichtsdoxologie." Pages 28–37 in *Schalom: Studien zu Glaube und Geschichte Israels: Alfred Jepsen zum 70sten Geburtstag*. Edited by Karl-Heinz Bernhardt. Arbeiten zur Theologie. Stuttgart: Calver Verlag, 1971.
- . *Old Testament Theology*. 2 vols. OTL. Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 2001.
- Reasoner, Mark. *Romans in Full Circle: A History of Interpretation*. Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 2005.
- Reed, Annette Yoshiko. *Fallen Angels and the History of Judaism and Christianity: The Reception of Enochic Literature*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005.
- Reumann, John Henry Paul. "Philippians 3:20–21—A Hymnic Fragment?" *NTS* 30 (1984): 593–609.
- Rey, Jean-Sébastien. *4QInstruction: sagesse et eschatologie*. STDJ 81. Leiden: Brill, 2009.
- Ricoeur, Paul. *The Symbolism of Evil*. New York: Beacon Press, 1969.
- . "Evil." Pages 5:199–208 in *The Encyclopedia of Religion*. Edited by Lindsay Jones. Detroit: Macmillan, 2005.
- Ringgren, Helmer. *The Faith of Qumran: Theology of the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1963.

- Robertson, Archibald, and Alfred Plummer. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the First Epistle of St. Paul to the Corinthians*. 2nd ed. ICC. Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1914.
- Robinson, John A. T. *The Body: A Study in Pauline Theology*. Louisville, KY: Westminster, 1977.
- Rowe, C. Kavin. "New Testament Iconography? Situating Paul in the Absence of Material Evidence." Pages 289–312 in *Picturing the New Testament: Studies in Ancient Visual Images*. Edited by Annette Weissenrieder, Friederike Wendt, and Petra von Gemünden. WUNT 193. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2005.
- Rowland, Christopher. *The Open Heaven: A Study of Apocalyptic in Judaism and Early Christianity*. London: SPCK, 1982.
- Rowland, Christopher, and C. R. A. Morray-Jones. *The Mystery of God: Early Jewish Mysticism and the New Testament*. CRINT 12. Leiden: Brill, 2009.
- Runia, David T. *On the Creation of the Cosmos according to Moses*. PACS. Leiden: Brill, 2001.
- Rusam, Dietrich. "Neue Belege zu den stoicheia tou kosmou (Gal 4,3.9, Kol 2,8.20)." *ZNW* 83 (1992): 119–25.
- Sanders, E. P. *Paul and Palestinian Judaism: A Comparison of Patterns of Religion*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1977.
- Schäfer, Peter. *The Origins of Jewish Mysticism*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2011.
- Schiffman, Lawrence H. *Reclaiming the Dead Sea Scrolls: The History of Judaism, the Background of Christianity, the Lost Library of Qumran*. New York: Doubleday, 1994.
- Schiffman, Lawrence H., and James C. VanderKam, eds. *Encyclopedia of the Dead Sea Scrolls*. 2 vols. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000.
- Schnelle, Udo. *The Human Condition: Anthropology in the Teachings of Jesus, Paul, John*. Translated by O. C. Dean. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1996.
- . *Apostle Paul: His Life and Theology*. Translated by M. Eugene Boring. Grand Rapids: Baker, 2005.
- Schreiner, Thomas R. "Head Coverings, Prophecies, and the Trinity: 1 Corinthians 11:2–6." Pages 209–24 in *Recovering Biblical Manhood and Womanhood: A Response to Evangelical Feminism*. Edited by John Piper and Wayne Grudem. Wheaton, IL: Crossway, 2006.
- . *Galatians*. ECNT. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2010.
- Schüle, Andreas. "Made in the 'Image of God': The Concepts of Divine Images in Gen 1–3." *ZAW* 117 (2005): 1–20.
- Schuller, Eileen M. "A Hymn from a Cave Four Hodayot Manuscript: 4Q427 7 i+ii." *JBL* 112 (1993): 605–28.
- . "The Cave 4 Hodayot Manuscripts: A Preliminary Description." *JQR* 85 (1994): 137–50.

- . "Petitionary Prayer and the Religion of Qumran." Pages 29–45 in *Religion in the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Edited by John J. Collins and Robert A. Kugler. SDSSRL. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000.
- . "Some Reflections on the Function and Use of Poetical Texts among the Dead Sea Scrolls." Pages 173–90 in *Liturgical Perspectives: Prayer and Poetry in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls: Proceedings of the Fifth International Symposium of the Orion Center for the Study of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Associated Literature, 19–23 January, 2000*. Edited by Esther G. Chazon. STDJ 48. Leiden: Brill, 2003.
- . "Recent Scholarship on the Hodayot 1993–2010." *CBR* 10 (2011): 119–62.
- Schultz, Brian. *Conquering the World: The War Scroll (1QM) Reconsidered*. STDJ 76. Leiden: Brill, 2009.
- Schulz, Siegfried. "Zur Rechtfertigung aus Gnaden im Qumran und bei Paulus: Zugleich ein Beitrag zur Form- und Überlieferungsgeschichte der Qumrantexte." *ZTK* 56 (1959): 155–85.
- Schweitzer, Albert. *The Mysticism of Paul the Apostle*. Translated by William Montgomery. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1998.
- Schweizer, Eduard. "Letter to the Colossians Neither Pauline nor Post-Pauline." Pages 3–16 in *Pluralisme et oecuménisme en recherches théologiques*. Edited by Yves Congar. Paris: Duculot, 1976.
- . *The Letter to the Colossians: A Commentary*. Translated by Andrew Chester. Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1982.
- . "Slaves of the Elements and Worshipers of Angels: Gal 4:3, 9 and Col 2:8, 18, 20." *JBL* 107 (1988): 455–68.
- Scroggs, Robin. *The Last Adam: A Study in Pauline Anthropology*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1966.
- Sekki, Arthur Everett. *The Meaning of Ruach at Qumran*. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1987.
- Shepherd, David. *Targum and Translation: A Reconsideration of the Qumran Aramaic Version of Job*. Assen: Uitgeverij Van Gorcum, 2004.
- . "'Strike His Bone and His Flesh': Reading Job from the Beginning." *JSOT* 33 (2008): 81–97.
- Sider, Ronald J. "Pauline Conception of the Resurrection Body in 1 Corinthians 15:35–54." *NTS* 21 (1975): 428–39.
- Sjöberg, Erik. "Neuschöpfung in den Toten-Meer-Rollen." *ST* 9 (1955): 131–36.
- Smith, Morton. "Ascent to the Heavens and Deification in 4QM^a." Pages 181–88 in *Archaeology and History in the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Edited by Lawrence H. Schiffman and Yigael Yadin. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1990.
- . "Two Ascended to Heaven—Jesus and the Author of 4Q491." Pages 290–301 in *Jesus and the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Edited by James Charlesworth. New York: Doubleday, 1992.

- Smyth, Herbert Weir. *A Greek Grammar*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1956.
- Sokoloff, Michael. *The Targum to Job from Qumran Cave XI*. Ramat-Gan: Bar-Ilan University, 1974.
- Sommer, Benjamin D. *The Bodies of God and the World of Ancient Israel*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011.
- Southgate, Christopher. *The Groaning of Creation: God, Evolution, and the Problem of Evil*. Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 2008.
- Sprinkle, Preston M. *Paul and Judaism Revisited: A Study of Divine and Human Agency in Salvation*. Downers Grove, IL: IVP Academic Press, 2013.
- Steenburg, Dave. "The Case against the Synonymity of Morphē and Eikōn." *JSNT* 34 (1988): 77–86.
- Stegemann, Hartmut. "Zu Textbestand und Grundgedanken von 1QS III, 13–IV, 26." *RevQ* 13 (1988): 95–130.
- . "The Number of Psalms in 1QHodayota and Some of Their Sections." Pages 191–234 in *Liturgical Perspectives: Prayer and Poetry in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls, Proceedings of the Fifth International Symposium of the Orion Center for the Study of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Associated Literature, 19–23 January, 2000*. Edited by E. Chazon. STDJ 48. Leiden: Brill, 2003.
- Stegemann, Hartmut, Eileen M. Schuller, and Carol A. Newsom, eds. *Qumran Cave 1.III: 1QHodayota, with Incorporation of 1QHodayotb and 4QHodayota-F*. DJD XL. Oxford: Clarendon, 2008.
- Stendahl, Krister. "The Apostle Paul and the Introspective Conscience of the West." Pages 78–96 in *Paul Among the Jews and Gentiles*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1976.
- Sterling, Gregory E. "'Wisdom among the Perfect': Creation Traditions in Alexandrian Judaism and Corinthian Christianity." *NovT* 37 (1995): 355–84.
- . "Prepositional Metaphysics in Jewish Wisdom Speculation and Early Christian Liturgical Texts." *SPhilo* 9 (1997): 219–38.
- . "'The Image of God': Becoming Like God in Philo, Paul, and Early Christianity." Pages 157–73 in *Portraits of Jesus*. Edited by Susan E. Myers. WUNT 2/321. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2012.
- Stettler, Christian. *Der Kolosserhymnus: Untersuchungen zu Form, traditionsgeschichtlichem Hintergrund und Aussage von Kol 1,15–20*. WUNT 2/131. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2000.
- Stordalen, Terje. *Echoes of Eden: Genesis 2–3 and Symbolism of the Eden Garden in Biblical Hebrew Literature*. Leuven: Peeters Publishers, 2000.
- Stowers, Stanley Kent. *A Rereading of Romans: Justice, Jews, and Gentiles*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1994.
- Stroumsa, Gedaliahu A. G. "Form(s) of God: Some Notes on Metatron and Christ." *HTR* 76 (1983): 269–88.

- Stuckenbruck, Loren T. "Why Should Women Cover Their Heads because of Angels? (1 Corinthians 11:10)." *Stone-Campbell Journal* 4 (2001): 205–34.
- Sukenik, Eleazar Lipa. *The Dead Sea Scrolls of the Hebrew University*. Jerusalem: Magnes Press, 1955.
- Sumney, Jerry L. *Colossians: A Commentary*. NTL. Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 2008.
- Sutherland, Robert. *Putting God on Trial: The Biblical Book of Job*. Victoria, BC: Trafford, 2004.
- Swanson, Dwight D. "4QCrypa Words of the Maskil to All Sons of Dawn: The Path of the Virtuous Life." Pages 49–61 in *Sapiential, Liturgical and Poetical Texts from Qumran: Proceedings of the Third Meeting of the International Organization for Qumran Studies, Oslo, 1998: Published in Memory of Maurice Baillet*. Edited by Maurice Baillet, Daniel K. Falk, Florentino García Martínez, and Eileen M. Schuller. STDJ 35. Leiden: Brill, 2000.
- Swarup, Paul. *The Self-Understanding of the Dead Sea Scrolls Community: An Eternal Planting, a House of Holiness*. London: T & T Clark, 2006.
- Talbert, Charles H. "The Problem of Pre-Existence in Philippians 2:6–11." *JBL* 86 (1967): 141–53.
- Tambiah, Stanley Jeyaraja. *Magic, Science, Religion, and the Scope of Rationality*. Lewis Henry Morgan Lectures. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990.
- Tanzer, Sarah Jean. "The Sages at Qumran: Wisdom in the Hodayat." PhD diss., Harvard University, 1987.
- Tennant, F. R. *The Sources of the Doctrines of the Fall and Original Sin*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1903.
- Theissen, Gerd. *Psychological Aspects of Pauline Theology*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1987.
- Thiselton, Anthony C. *The First Epistle to the Corinthians*. NIGTC. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000.
- Thrall, Margaret E. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Second Epistle to the Corinthians*. 2 vols. ICC. Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1994.
- Tigchelaar, Eibert J. C. *To Increase Learning for the Understanding Ones: Reading and Reconstructing the Fragmentary Early Jewish Sapiential Text 4QInstruction*. WUNT 44. Leiden: Brill, 2001.
- . "‘Spiritual People,’ ‘Fleshly Spirit,’ and ‘Vision of Meditation’: Reflections on 4QInstruction and 1 Corinthians." Pages 103–18 in *Echoes from the Caves: Qumran and the New Testament*. Edited by Florentino Martínez. STDJ 85. Leiden: Brill, 2009.
- . "בִּשְׁרָ." Pages 537–48 in *Theologisches Wörterbuch zu den Qumrantexten*. Edited by Heinz-Josef Fabry and Ulrich Dahmen. Stuttgart: Kolhammer, 2010.
- Tiller, Patrick. "The Eternal Planting in the Dead Sea Scrolls." *DSD* 4 (1997): 312–35.
- Tobin, Thomas H. "The Jewish Context of Rom 5:12–14." *SPhilo* 13 (2001): 159–75.

- Tooman, William A. "Between Imitation and Interpretation: Reuse of Scripture and Composition in Hodayot (1QH^a) 11:6–19." *DSD* 18 (2011): 54–73.
- Tsumura, David Toshio. "An OT Background to Rom 8:22." *NTS* 40 (1994): 620–21.
- Tuinstra, E. W. *Hermeneutische aspecten van de Targum van Job uit grot XI van Qumran*. Groningen: Dissertation, Rijksuniversiteit te Groningen, 1970.
- Tukasi, Emmanuel O. *Determinism and Petitionary Prayer in John and the Dead Sea Scrolls: An Ideological Reading of John and the Rule of the Community (1QS)*. LSTS 66. London: T & T Clark, 2008.
- VanLandingham, Chris. *Judgment and Justification in Early Judaism and the Apostle Paul*. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2006.
- Vlachos, Chris A. "Law, Sin, and Death: An Edenic Triad? An Examination with Reference to 1 Corinthians 15:56." *JETS* 47 (2004): 277–98.
- . *The Law and the Knowledge of Good and Evil: The Edenic Background of the Catalytic Operation of the Law in Paul*. Eugene, OR: Pickwick Publications, 2009.
- Vogt, Kari. "Becoming Male': A Gnostic and Early Christian Metaphor." Pages 172–87 in *Image of God and Gender Models in Judaeo-Christian Tradition*. Edited by Kari Elisabeth Børresen. Oslo: Solum Forlag, 1991.
- Vos, Geerhardus. *The Pauline Eschatology*. 2nd ed. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1961.
- Wallis, Wilber B. "Problem of an Intermediate Kingdom in 1 Corinthians 15:20–28." *JETS* 18 (1975): 229–42.
- Waltke, Bruce K., and Michael Patrick O'Connor. *An Introduction to Biblical Hebrew Syntax*. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1990.
- Wanamaker, C. A. "Philippians 2.6–11: Son of God or Adamic Christology?" *NTS* 33 (1987): 179–93.
- Wasserman, Emma. "The Death of the Soul in Romans 7: Revisiting Paul's Anthropology in Light of Hellenistic Moral Psychology." *JBL* 126 (2007): 793–816.
- . *The Death of the Soul in Romans 7: Sin, Death, and the Law in Light of Hellenistic Moral Psychology*. WUNT 256. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008.
- Watson, Francis. "Strategies of Recovery and Resistance: Hermeneutical Reflections on Genesis 1–3 and Its Pauline Reception." *JSNT* 45 (1992): 79–103.
- . "The Authority of the Voice: A Theological Reading of 1 Cor 11.2–16." *NTS* 46 (2000): 520–36.
- . *Paul and the Hermeneutics of Faith*. London: T & T Clark, 2004.
- Weaver, David. "From Paul to Augustine: Romans 5:12 in Early Christian Exegesis." *SVTQ* 27 (1983): 187–206.
- . "The Exegesis of Romans 5:12 among the Greek Fathers and Its Implication for the Doctrine of Original Sin: The 5th–12th Centuries, Pt 2." *SVTQ* 29 (1985): 133–59.
- Weber, Max. *Ancient Judaism*. Glencoe, IL: Free Press, 1952.
- Wedderburn, A. J. M. "Theological Structure of Romans 5:12." *NTS* 19 (1973): 339–54.

- . "Adam in Paul's Letter to the Romans." Pages 413–30 in *Studia Biblica* 1978, 3. Sheffield: JSOT, 1980.
- Weissenrieder, Annette. "Der Blick in den Spiegel: 11 Kor 3,18 vor dem Hintergrund antiker Spiegeltheorien und ikonographischer Abbildungen." Pages 313–43 in *Picturing the New Testament: Studies in Ancient Visual Images*. Edited by Annette Weissenrieder, Friederike Wendt, and Petra von Gemünden. WUNT 193. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2005.
- Werline, Rodney Alan. *Penitential Prayer in Second Temple Judaism: The Development of a Religious Institution*. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1998.
- Wernberg-Møller, P. *The Manual of Discipline: Translated and Annotated with an Introduction*. STDJ 1. Leiden: Brill, 1957.
- . "Reconsideration of the Two Spirits in the Rule of the Community (IQSerek 111,13–1V,26)." *RevQ* 3 (1961): 413–41.
- Westerholm, Stephen. *Perspectives Old and New on Paul: The "Lutheran" Paul and His Critics*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2004.
- . "Paul's Anthropological 'Pessimism' in Its Jewish Context." Pages 71–98 in *Divine and Human Agency in Paul and His Cultural Environment*. Edited by John M. G. Barclay and Simon J. Gathercole. London: T & T Clark, 2008.
- Wilckens, Ulrich. *Der Brief an Die Römer*. EKK VI/1–3. Zurich: Benziger, Neukirchener, 1978.
- Wildeberger, H. *A Continental Commentary: Isaiah 13–27*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1997.
- Williams, Norman Powell. *The Ideas of the Fall and of Original Sin: A Historical and Critical Study*. London: Longmans, Green, 1927.
- Wilson, Robert McLachlan. *Colossians and Philemon*. ICC. London: T & T Clark, 2005.
- Windisch, Hans. *Der Zweite Korintherbrief*. Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1924.
- Wise, Michael O. "That which Has Been Is that which Shall Be: 4QFlorilegium and the מקדש אדם." *RevQ* 15 (1991): 103–32.
- . "מי כמוני באלים": A Study of 4Q491c, 4Q471b, 4Q427 7 and 1QH^a 25:35–26:10." *DSD* 7 (2000): 173–219.
- Wise, Michael O., Martin G. Abegg, and Edward M. Cook. *The Dead Sea Scrolls: A New Translation*. 2nd ed. San Francisco: Harper, 2005.
- Witherington, Ben. *Women in the Earliest Churches*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991.
- . *Paul's Narrative Thought World: The Tapestry of Tragedy and Triumph*. Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 1994.
- . *The Indelible Image: The Theological and Ethical Thought World of the New Testament, Volume Two: The Collective Witness*. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 2010.

- Wold, Benjamin G. *Women, Men and Angels: The Qumran Wisdom Document Musar leMevin and Its Allusions to Genesis Creation Traditions*. WUNT 201. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2005.
- Wolfson, Elliot R. "Seven Mysteries of Knowledge: Qumran E/Sotericism Recovered." Pages 177–213 in *The Idea of Biblical Interpretation: Essays in Honor of James L. Kugel*. Edited by Hindy Najman. JSJSup 83. Leiden: Brill, 2004.
- Worrell, John E. "עצה: 'Counsel' or 'Council' at Qumran?" VT 20 (1970): 65–74.
- Worthington, Jonathan D. *Creation in Paul and Philo: The Beginning and Before*. WUNT 317. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2011.
- Wright, N. T. "Harpagmos and the Meaning of Philippians 2:5–11." JTS 37 (1986): 321–52.
- . *The Epistles of Paul to the Colossians and Philemon*. TNTC. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1986.
- . *The Climax of the Covenant: Christ and the Law in Pauline Theology*. Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1991.
- . *Romans*. Vol. 10. NIB. Nashville: Abingdon, 1994.
- . *The Resurrection of the Son of God*. Volume 3 of *Christian Origins and the Question of God*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2003.
- . *Paul and the Faithfulness of God*. Volume 4 of *Christian Origins and the Question of God*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2013.
- Yadin, Yigael. "A Note on DSD IV:20." JBL 74 (1955): 40–43.
- Yates, John W. *The Spirit and Creation in Paul*. WUNT 251. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008.
- Zeller, Dieter. "Die Formel einai panta en pasin (1 Kor 15,28)." ZNW 101 (2010): 148–52.
- Ziesler, John A. "Anthropology of Hope." ExpT 90 (1979): 104–9.
- . "The Role of the Tenth Commandment in Romans 7." JSNT 33 (1988): 41–56.
- Zimmerli, Walther. *Ezekiel: A Commentary on the Book of the Prophet Ezekiel*. Translated by James D. Martin. Hermeneia. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1983.
- Zurli, Emanuela. "La giustificazione 'solo per grazia' in 1QS x,9–x1 e 1QH^a." RevQ 79 (2002): 445–77.
- . *La giustificazione "solo per grazia" negli scritti di Qumran: Analisi dell'inno finale della Regola della comunità e degli Inni*. Napoli: Chirico, 2003.

Index of Modern Authors

- Aasgaard, R. 198n71
Abegg, M. G. 63n139, 66n145, 68n150,
79n182, 80n183
Adams, E. 98n11, 103n26, 146n179, 167n247,
173n261, 175, 177nn6,7,8
Alexander, P. S. 10n30, 29n43, 79n182
Anderson, G. 38n70
Angel, J. L. 58n128, 72n162, 80n183, 81,
85n201
Antonissen, H. 23n30
Asher, J. R. 118, 120, 124n101, 127n113

Baillet, M. 79n182
Balentine, S. E. 226n159
Barclay, J. M. G. 3n6, 29n43, 98n10, 102n26,
191n52
Bardtke, H. 4n7
Barrett, C. K. 13, 122n94, 130n122, 136n145,
163n231, 177n3, 183n27, 197nn69,70,
204n88, 214n115
Barth, K. 12n41
Batsch, C. 81n191
Bauckham, R. 158n214, 159, 219n133
Becker, J. 3n5, 8, 32, 34, 35–36, 57
Behm, J. 148n181
Beker, J. C. 134n136, 220n138
Bell, R. H. 178n10, 180n19
Belleville, L. L. 136n142, 142n165, 168n247
Berg, S. 6n13, 8n23, 23n30, 59n129, 74n167
Berger, P. 193n59
Betz, H. D. 96n2, 97n8
Bird, P. A. 99n13, 110n53
Black, M. 132n130, 137n147, 163n231, 165n239
Blackwell, B. C. 15n57, 16, 132n132, 137n151,
141n163, 142n165, 211n106, 219n135
Bockmuehl, M. N. A. 74n167, 147n180, 150–151,
151n193, 153nn200,202, 157n211, 158n214
Boda, M. J. 33n52
Boer, M. C. de 127n114, 134n136, 163n229,
163–164, 164n236, 166n244, 168n248
Børresen, K. E. 111
Boucher, M. 108n43
Boyarín, D. 107n41, 135n138
Braaten, L. J. 216nn121,124, 217n127, 219n133
Brand, M. T. 4n8, 6n11
Brandenburger, E. 183n29
Braun, H. 3n5, 200
Bray, G. 117n79
Brooke, G. J. 72n161, 73n165
Bruce, F. F. 183n30
Bultmann, R. 12n41, 100n19, 133n135,
168n248, 183n29, 203n87
Burney, C. F. 155n208
Busch, A. 195n63, 197n66, 207
Byrne, B. J. 216n122, 219n134, 220–221,
222nn147,148

Caevel, J. de. 74n167
Caird, G. B. 170n253
Calef, S. A. 106n35
Campbell, D. A. 194nn60,61
Campbell, D. H. 197n67
Carmignac, J. 21n20, 59n129, 87n204
Carr, W. 170n253
Casimir, Brother 174n263
Cerfaux, L. 158n214
Charlesworth, J. H. 75nn169,170
Chazon, E. 9n28, 10n30, 23n29, 33, 34n58,
72n162, 73n166
Chester, S. J. 194n60
Christoffersson, O. 215n120
Ciampa, R. E. 131n128, 133n133, 164n237
Clines, D. J. A. 60n130, 101n22, 110n53, 136n145
Coats, G. W. 35
Collins, J. J. 6, 21n17, 42n81, 50n103, 58n128,
68n152, 72n162, 79n182, 84n199, 87n204,
88n208, 171n256
Collins, R. F. 130n122
Conzelmann, H. 109n50, 112n61, 169n251
Cook, E. M. 66n145, 68n150
Cousar, C. B. 147n180, 161
Cox, R. 114n69, 154n203, 155n208
Cranfield, C. E. B. 177nn4,6, 195n62, 197n69,
203n87, 211n106, 219n137
Crenshaw, J. L. 32n52
Crossan, J. D. 158n216
Crouch, C. 101n20

Dahl, N. A. 162n227
Daise, M. A. 71n158, 75n170
D'Angelo, M. R. 102n25, 107–108, 109n49
Das, A. A. 196n65, 197n66

- Davidson, M. J. 73n162
 Davies, P. R. 75n169
 Davies, W. D. 4n7
 Davila, J. R. 70n155
 Dietzel, A. 3n5
 Dimant, D. 72n162, 80n185
 Doble, P. 160n221
 Dodd, B. 197n68
 Douglas, M. C. 20n12, 31n48, 32n49, 75n169
 Duff, P. B. 136n142, 142n165
 Duhaime, J. 25n34
 Dunn, J. D. G. 15, 97, 102n23, 123n100, 141n164, 153n201, 155nn206,207, 163n231, 166n243, 167n247, 177n3, 197n69, 203n86
 Dunning, B. H. 106n35
- Eastman, S. G. 215n120, 216n123, 218n129
 Ellis, E. E. 164n237
 Eltester, F. W. 14n56, 100n19, 136nn144,145, 136-137
 Elwolde, J. F. 37n69, 39n76
 Enderlein, S. E. 211n106
 Engberg-Pedersen, T. 118-119, 120
 Eriksson, A. 164n235
 Eshel, E. 79n182, 83n195, 87n206, 88n207
 Eskola, T. 194n60
 Esler, P. F. 196n65, 202n83
- Fatum, L. 103n29, 106n37
 Feder, Y. 47n94
 Fee, G. D. 14-15, 110n55, 112n63, 117n78, 130n122, 131n126, 137, 138, 148-149, 153n201, 154n205, 155-156, 163n230, 165n238
 Feinstein, E. L. 47nn93,94
 Feuillet, A. 112n62
 Finlan, S. 135
 Fishbane, M. 227n161
 Fitzmyer, J. A. 61n135, 77n174, 113n65, 124n101, 125n106, 126n109, 133n133, 165n238, 167n245, 168n249, 169n251, 173n260, 177nn3,4, 179-180, 181n21, 183n28, 197n69, 200n78, 211n106, 217, 217n128
 Fletcher-Louis, C. H. T. 8-9, 56-57, 57n123, 64n141, 70n155, 73n164, 76n171, 78n180, 81, 92n219
 Fossum, J. 151n191, 152n197
 Fowl, S. E. 147n180, 151n191, 153n202, 159
 Fredrickson, D. E. 174n263
- Frennesson, B. 72n162
 Frey, J. 3n6, 25n33, 41n78, 42n81
- García Martínez, F. 27n38, 79n182, 80nn183,184
 Garland, D. 105n31, 107n40, 125n107, 126n109
 Gibbs, J. G. 223, 223n152, 224n154
 Gieschen, C. A. 152n195
 Gladd, B. L. 128n16
 Goff, M. J. 6n13, 9n27, 23n30, 28n41, 40n77, 42n81, 46n90
 Goldingay, J. 111n56
 Goppelt, L. 188
 Gordley, M. 26n36, 27n39
 Gorman, M. J. 14n55, 16, 147n180, 153n202, 157n211, 158n216, 195n62
 Greenfield, J. C. 33n56
 Greer, R. A. 12n37
 Grundmann, W. 3n5
 Gundry, R. H. 196n65, 204n89
 Gundry-Volf, J. M. 98-99, 107n41
 Gunkel, H. 111n56
 Gupta, N. 160n219, 161n225
- Haber, S. 57n121
 Habermann, J. 153n200
 Hafemann, S. J. 138n153, 140n161
 Hahne, H. 215n120, 216n123, 218n131, 219nn132,134,137, 223nn151,153
 Hanson, A. T. 141n164
 Harkins, A. K. 6n15, 8, 9n28, 9-10, 20nn12,14, 21n18, 23n29, 34n58, 38n72, 73n166
 Harrington, D. J. 27n39
 Harrington, H. K. 47-48, 49, 51n105
 Harris, M. J. 142n165, 143nn169,170, 144n172
 Hasselbalch, T. B. 20n14
 Hawthorne, G. F. 151n194, 157n211
 Hay, D. M. 155n206, 165n238
 Hays, R. B. 165n237
 Heger, P. 7n19, 30n43
 Heil, J. P. 126n110, 155n206, 165n238
 Heil, U. 165n238, 169n250
 Hempel, C. 21n19
 Herring, S. L. 110n56
 Hick, J. 225
 Hill, C. E. 164n235, 166n243, 168n249, 169
 Hincks, E. Y. 167n247
 Hofius, O. 153n200, 185n36

- Hogan, P. N. 96n3
 Holm-Nielsen, S. 22n28, 64, 73n163, 78n180
 Hooker, M. D. 15n60, 113n64, 145n176, 160, 211n106
 Hoover, R. W. 157n211
 Horst, F. 32n52
 Howard, G. 153n201
 Hubner, H. 4n7
 Hughes, J. A. 20n13, 37–38
 Hultgård, A. 114n70, 116n76
 Hultgren, A. J. 177n3, 179n14, 186n40, 191n53, 192nn54,56, 196nn64,65, 197n67, 221n144
 Hultgren, S. J. 3n6, 6–7, 33n53, 34n57, 38, 54n114, 78n180, 127n114
 Huppenbauer, H. W. 4n7
 Hurtado, L. W. 149, 160n219
 Hyatt, J. P. 6n12
- Janzen, J. G. 226nn157,159
 Jassen, A. P. 74n167
 Jeremias, G. 19n11, 75n169
 Jeremias, J. 123n100, 158n214
 Jervell, J. 14n56, 108n43, 136–137, 137n148, 150n185
 Jarvis, L. A. 114n66
 Jewett, R. 177n7, 179, 179n15, 186nn40,41, 191nn52,53, 196n65, 197n67, 200, 206n94
 Johnson, A. 166n241
- Kahl, B. 102n25
 Kampen, J. 42n81
 Käsemann, E. 13, 159n219, 178n9, 185n36, 191n53, 192n57, 198n72, 202n83, 203n87, 212n108
 Kazen, T. 47n94
 Keck, L. E. 177n3, 179n11, 180, 191n52, 213n114
 Keener, C. S. 110n55
 Keesmaat, S. C. 218n130, 219n133
 Kim, S. 152n195
 Kirby, J. T. 177n3
 Kister, M. 128n115
 Klawans, J. 7, 47, 51, 53, 56–57
 Kooten, G. H. van 68, 70n155, 139n157, 144, 149–150, 151n193
 Kosmala, H. 59n129
 Kuhn, H-W. 3n5, 7, 19n11, 22n28, 32, 32n51, 33n55, 35n60
 Kuhn, K. G. 3n5, 4n7, 200
- Kümmel, W. G. 105n33, 137, 197nn67,69
 Kvalvaag, R. W. 26n35
- Laato, T. 194n60, 197n69, 207n101
 Lacocque, A. 225n157
 Lakey, M. 105, 106n35, 109n51, 114n69, 115n71, 115–116, 173n261
 Lambrecht, J. 142n165, 145n176, 165n238, 196n64, 197n67
 Lampe, G. W. H. 217n128, 220n141
 Lange, A. 6n14, 20n15, 21n19, 28, 42n81
 Laqueur, T. W. 115
 Lehtipuu, O. 117n79
 Lemos, T. M. 47n94
 Levison, J. R. 10n33, 26n35, 46n91, 49n102, 77nn175,176, 129, 211n106
 Lewis, S. M. 164n235, 173n262
 Lichtenberger, H. 4–5, 6n12, 32n51, 33n56, 34n57, 36, 55, 67n148, 93n220, 185n35, 196nn64,65, 197n70, 200, 203n87, 212n108
 Licht, J. 8nn21,24, 19n9, 22, 24, 31, 67n148
 Lienhard, J. T. 174n263
 Lincoln, A. T. 102n24, 121n93, 134, 146n178, 161n223, 162n226
 Litwa, M. D. 16, 92n219, 101n21, 123n98, 138n153, 143n168, 145n176, 161n224
 Loader, W. 7, 57, 68n153, 78n180, 93n220, 98, 109–110, 110n56
 Lohmeyer, E. 147n180
 Lohse, E. 155n206
 Longenecker, R. N. 167n247, 196n65, 197n69
 Lorenzen, S. 15n57, 15, 111n58, 131n26, 136n144, 137, 138, 142n165, 144, 222n146
 Louth, A. 174n264
 Lyonnet, S. 196n65
- Macaskill, G. 10n33, 67n149, 70n155, 140n161, 166n243, 184n34, 208n102, 210n104
 MacDonald, D. R. 97n7
 MacDonald, M. Y. 155n206
 Maier, G. 50n102
 Maile, J. F. 125n108, 173n261
 Mansoor, M. 73n163
 Marcus, J. 213n110
 Martin, D. B. 97n3, 103n29, 106n35, 118–119, 119n86, 120
 Martin, R. P. 147n180, 157nn211,212, 160n219
 Martini, J. Q. 167n246
 Martyn, J. L. 99, 103n29

- Maston, J. 3n6, 4n8, 10, 31n46, 197n69,
206n97, 213n110
- Matera, F. J. 167n247
- McCasland, S. V. 136n145
- McDonough, S. M. 115n71, 154n204, 155n208,
156n210, 172n257
- McGinn, S. E. 220n141
- Meadowcroft, T. J. 171n256
- Meeks, W. A. 96n2, 97
- Meier, S. 227n161
- Meiser, M. 163
- Merrill, E. H. 29n43
- Mettinger, T. N. D. 132n129
- Metzger, B. M. 130n122, 216n122
- Meyer, N. A. 33n56, 39n74
- Milgrom, J. 76n173
- Miller, E. 8, 81n91
- Montgomery, E. 74n167
- Moo, D. J. 196nn64, 65, 66, 205, 211n106,
219n137, 222nn147, 148
- Moo, J. 217n124, 219n133
- Morisette, R. 164nn234, 235, 169n250, 172n258
- Murray-Jones, C. R. A. 158n215, 214n117
- Moule, C. F. D. 155n206, 156n209
- Mowinckel, S. 74n168
- Muddiman, J. 182n24
- Muraoka, T. 129n117
- Murphy, R. E. 4n7
- Murphy-O'Connor, J. 106n38, 153n201
- Newman, C. C. 125n105, 140n161, 141n164,
143n170, 152n195, 170n254
- Newsom, C. A. 5, 8n23, 19n7, 20n12, 21n19,
26–27, 29, 31, 33n54, 36n66, 48, 51n106,
52n110, 74n167, 77nn175, 176, 225n157,
226, 227
- Nickelsburg, G. W. E. 6n15
- Nicolet-Anderson, V. 197n67
- Nitzan, B. 23n29, 27n38
- O'Brien, P. T. 147n180, 151n192, 159n218
- O'Connor, M. P. 36n67
- Økland, J. 115nn72, 74
- O'Neill, J. C. 157n211
- Orlov, A. A. 77n174
- Pate, C. M. 145n177
- Painter, J. 173n261
- Penna, R. 128n115, 132n132, 135nn139, 140
- Penner, K. M. 57n123
- Perdue, L. G. 226n159
- Perkins, P. 206n97, 222n148
- Plummer, A. 123nn97, 99, 129n118, 145n176,
173n260
- Pope, M. H. 60n130
- Price, R. M. 214n117
- Puech, E. 20n13, 21nn21, 22, 24n31, 65n145,
80n182, 82n194, 83n196
- Qimron, E. 20n13, 24n31, 44n86, 62n136,
65n145, 73n166, 76n171, 78n178, 82n194,
83n196, 86n202
- Quispel, G. 152n198
- Rabens, V. 119nn86, 87, 136n142, 144n174,
145n176
- Rad, G. von 32n52, 111n56
- Reasoner, M. 196n64
- Reed, A. Y. 39n75
- Reed, J. L. 158n216
- Reid, D. G. 170n253
- Reumann, J. H. P. 147n180
- Rey, J.-S. 9n27, 40n77, 41n78, 42n81, 43n83
- Ricoeur, P. 1–2, 93, 192n57, 218n129
- Ringgren, H. 48n99
- Robertson, A. 123nn97, 99, 129n118, 173n260
- Robinson, J. A. T. 186n38
- Rosner, B. S. 131n128, 133n133, 164n237
- Rowe, C. K. 131n127, 137n151
- Rowland, C. 126n111, 158n215
- Runia, D. T. 199n73
- Rusam, D. 167n247
- Sanders, E. P. 3, 4, 16n60, 194n60
- Schäfer, P. 64n140
- Schiffman, L. H. 22n26, 58n127
- Schnelle, U. 105n33, 202n82, 213n111
- Schreiner, T. R. 97n4, 110n55, 113n64
- Schrenck, G. 191n53
- Schüle, A. 111n56
- Schuller, E. M. 9n28, 18n1, 20n13, 21n18,
22n24, 23n29, 62n136, 73n164, 79n181,
80nn184, 185, 83n195, 87n205
- Schultz, B. 79n182
- Schulz, S. 3n5, 22
- Schweitzer, A. 194n60
- Schweizer, E. 155n206, 167n247
- Scroggs, R. 12–13, 14, 15–16, 106n36, 132n132,
133n135, 137, 145n177, 163n230, 177n13,
185n38

- Seifrid, M. 182n26, 184n34, 212n107
 Sekki, A. E. 26n35
 Shepherd, D. 61n35, 226n161
 Sider, R. J. 117–120
 Sjöberg, E. 56
 Smith, M. 79n182
 Smyth, H. W. 123n96
 Sommer, B. D. 110n56
 Southgate, C. 217n127
 Sprinkle, P. M. 4n8
 Steenburg, D. 148n181, 150nn185, 187, 150, 151n191, 222n146
 Stegemann, H. 24n31, 25n34, 44n86, 62n136, 65nn144, 145, 82n194
 Stendahl, K. 197n67
 Sterling, G. E. 128n115, 157n210, 173n261
 Stettler, C. 152n195, 155n206
 Stordalen, T. 72n160
 Stowers, S. K. 196n65, 197n66
 Stroumsa, G. A. G. 152n198, 208n102
 Stuckenbruck, L. T. 113nn64, 65
 Sukenik, E. L. 19n10, 65n145
 Sumney, J. L. 155n206, 156n209
 Sutherland, R. 226n161
 Swanson, D. D. 59n129
 Swarup, P. 71n158, 73n165
- Talbert, C. H. 153n201
 Tambiah, S. J. 193n59
 Tanzer, S. J. 6n14, 23n30, 32n51
 Tennant, F. R. 12n37
 Theissen, G. 186n39
 Thiselton, A. C. 105n32, 112n62, 122n95, 130n122, 169n251
 Thrall, M. E. 142n165, 143, 143nn169, 144n171, 146n179
 Tigchelaar, E. J. C. 9n27, 25n32, 40n77, 41n78, 42n81
 Tiller, P. 71n158
 Tobin, T. H. 177n3, 179n15, 182n26, 187n41
 Tooman, W. A. 59n129
 Tsumura, D. T. 217n126
 Tuinstra, E. W. 59n129, 61n135
 Tukasi, E. O. 29n43
- VanLandingham, C. 4n8
 Vlachos, C. A. 133n134, 185nn35, 37, 186n39, 195n63, 196n65, 210n105
- Vogt, K. 103n29, 111n57
 Vos, G. 121
- Wallis, W. B. 168n249, 169n250
 Waltke, B. K. 36n67
 Wanamaker, C. A. 157n211
 Wasserman, E. 196nn65, 66
 Watson, F. 107–108, 109n49, 110n53, 112n63, 196n66, 197nn67, 69, 70, 202n83, 211n107, 213n112
 Weaver, D. 183n32
 Weber, M. 193n59
 Wedderburn, A. J. M. 181nn20, 22, 182n25, 211n106, 214n116
 Weissenrieder, A. 142n165
 Werline, R. A. 33n52
 Wernberg-Møller, P. 49n102, 50n103, 67n148
 Westerholm, S. 3n6, 168n248, 194n60
 Wilckens, U. 177n6, 202n83, 207n100, 216n123, 217n128
 Wildeberger, H. 90n213
 Williams, N. P. 12n37
 Wilson, R. M. 155n206
 Windisch, H. 137
 Wise, M. O. 19n5, 66n145, 68n150, 73n165, 79n182, 81n189, 81, 82nn192, 194
 Witherington, B. 97–98, 110n55, 205n91
 Wold, B. G. 42n81, 72n162
 Wolfson, E. R. 74n167
 Worrell, J. E. 74n168
 Worthington, J. D. 15n57, 131n126, 137, 138, 141n162, 223n150
 Wright, N. T. 14n54, 118–120, 124n103, 125n105, 129n119, 136n142, 140n161, 142n165, 147n180, 155n206, 156n210, 157n211, 158n214, 162n228, 163, 165n239, 177n3, 180, 186n39, 189n48, 190n49, 192n57, 196n66, 197n69, 202n83
- Yadin, Y. 66n146
 Yates, J. W. 75n170, 77n175, 78n180
- Zeller, D. 173
 Ziesler, J. A. 11–13, 14, 106n36, 204nn89, 90
 Zimmerli, W. 89n210, 90nn212, 214, 91n217, 152n196
 Zurli, E. 3n6

Index of Ancient Sources

Hebrew Bible

Genesis

1	1, 16, 29, 98, 120, 126n112, 147
1–2	45n89, 109, 126n114, 137n151, 175
1–3	13, 15, 16, 42n81, 64n142, 101n22, 107, 117, 133, 133n135, 145n177, 161, 164, 165, 168, 176, 187, 190, 215, 218, 226n161, 235–236
1:1	126n112, 155n208
1:1–5	77
1:2	44n85, 45, 78
1:3	76, 146
1:3–5	76
1:4b–5	29
1:11	126n112
1:12	126n112
1:14	76
1:14–18	126n112
1:20	129
1:21	129
1:24	129
1:26	99, 100, 112, 126n112, 149n183, 156n209, 162, 190
1:26–27	8, 12, 15, 42, 64, 70, 70n155, 78, 95, 98n10, 101, 101n20, 103n27, 107, 108, 108n44, 109n52, 110, 110n56, 112n59, 113, 116n76, 131, 132, 135, 141, 149, 147–156, 155n208, 208, 222, 223, 232–236
1:26–28	67, 91, 172, 174, 221, 223
1:26–30	69, 70, 71, 220
1:27	98, 68n152, 95, 96n1, 97, 97n7, 98, 99, 102, 103n229, 104, 137n146, 149n183
1:28	69, 98, 103n28, 126n112, 190

1:28–30

1:29

1:30

2

2–3

2:1

2:4

2:6–7

2:7

2:8

2:11–12

2:15

2:16

2:16–17

2:17

2:18

2:18–25

2:19

2:21–22

2:21–23

2:22

2:23

2:24

2:25

3

3:1

3:1–5

3:5

3:6

3:8

3:10

3:11

100

64n143

129

37, 45–46, 98, 108n44, 113, 116n76

6, 8, 29, 37n68, 41, 42, 74, 90, 91n216, 103n27, 131, 180, 181, 184n35,

193, 198n72, 199, 201n80, 202n83,

218n129, 225, 226, 229, 233–236

126n112

126n112

33n56, 45, 50n102, 64, 70, 91, 232, 233

10, 40, 41, 44, 45n89, 46n92, 50n103, 67, 77, 98n10, 107, 110n56, 120,

128–129, 193, 206, 208, 209

72

90n211

220

98n10, 184n35, 206, 208

186, 186n40, 193, 208 153n201, 205

108, 113

109n52

129

97

107

49n102

113

108, 116n77

34n57, 126n112, 209

1, 175

209

206n95

74

183n27, 205

43

43

43, 184n35

Genesis (cont.)		13:30	211n106
3:13	204, 205	15:11	88
3:14–19	190, 215, 216, 217n127, 220	16:7	35n61
		16:8	35n61
3:16	217	18:18	218
3:17	184n35, 216n124	19:5–6	86
3:17–19	177, 217n127	20:17	205
3:19	10, 40, 44, 48, 92n218, 193, 220	20:25	77n177
		24:16	151n194
3:21	168n248	24:17	151n194
3:22	74, 101, 193	28:17–20	90n211
3:22–23	103n27	29:24	78n177
3:22–24	153n201	33:18	151n194
3:24	72	33:18–23	143
4:2ff.	44n85	33:20–23	141n164
5:1	112n59, 116n76	33:22	151n194
5:1–2	101n20, 110n56	34	135
5:2	96, 96n1	34:6	191
5:2–3	222	34:29–35	76
5:3	100, 101n20, 112n59, 115, 116n76, 128n115, 130–131, 149n183, 223n150	34:34	141n164
		40:34–35	151n194
5:5	98n10, 153n201	Leviticus	
5:24	131	3:1	96n1
5:29	216	12:4–5	49
6:1–4	103n27	12:7	34n57
6:1–7	6	15:33	96n1
6:2	101	17–27	47
6:3	46n89	18:5	206n96
6:4	104n29	19:28	129
6:5	44	21:4	129
6:17	46n89, 128n115	22:4	129
7:15	46n89, 128n115	21:11	129
7:21	199	23:11	78n177
7:22	46n89	Numbers	
8:21	44	6:6	129
11:1–9	103n27	12:8	143, 151n191
15:6	199	16:11	35n61
18:27	40, 60n134	24:17	42n81
31:7	211n106	Deuteronomy	
31:36	35n61	1:39	198n72
37:26	35n61	11:17	126
Exodus		Judges	
1:16	96n1	9:28	35n61
3:11	35n61	9:38	35n61
5:2	35n61		
9:27	32n52		

1 Samuel		49:5	46n89
17:26	35n61	49:7	87
25:10	35n61	50:4–9	87
		51:12	35n61
2 Samuel		52:13	87, 159
3:29	51	52:14	151n191
7:14	165n239	53:3	87
7:18	35n61	53:12	87
9:8	35n61	56:2	68n152
18:18	35n61	57:15	159
		59:7–8	213
1 Kings		60:19–20	77
18:9	35n61	60:21	71
		61:3	71
2 Kings		64:5	51
5:11	78n177	65:17	146n179
8:13	35n61	65:17–25	220
		66:22	146n179, 220
Isaiah		Jeremiah	
6:1	159	1:5	45n89
6:1–7	10	4:27–31	219
13:12	68n152	13:26	34n57
14:3–23	88	17:5	46n89
14:9–19	88–89		
24–27	217n124	Ezekiel	
24:3	218	1:26–28	70n155, 101n20,
24:4–6	219		151n194, 152n195
29:16	37n68	1:28	141n164, 152
30:26	76	11:19	77
40–55	88	18:5–9	51
40:18	87	19:11	83n198
40:25	87	22:22	62n136
41:25	37n68	28:1–10	89
42:4	87	28:2–5	89
42:21	87	28:11–19	89
43:4	87	28:13–14	89–90
43:18–19	146n179	28:15–17	90
43:21	46n89	31	72
44:2	46n89	31:1–14	83n198
44:6–7	87	36:17	51
44:21	46n89	36:25–26	77
44:24	46n89		
45:7	45n89	Hosea	
45:18	45n89	6:7	184n35
45:23	158n214		
46:5	87	Joel	
49:2–3	87	1:10–12	219
49:4	44n85	1:17–20	219

Amos		62:3	124
4:13	45n89	89:3	126
		89:7	87, 101
Nahum		89:29	126
3:5	34n57	90:3	45n88
		100:3	186n40
Zephaniah		103:14	45n88
1:2–3	219	104:1–2	77
		104:29	45n88
Zechariah		106:20	211n106
12:1	45n89	110	15, 86, 165n238
		110:1	164, 165n239, 171
Malachi		110:5–6	166n244
2:6	56n119	139:4 LXX	213
		139:13	48
Psalms		139:15	48
2:7	165n239	143:2	35
5:10 LXX	213	144:3	35n61, 68n152
8	15, 64, 67, 69, 70, 71, 78, 90, 91, 101n22, 103n27, 161n225, 166n244, 168, 171, 220, 221, 232, 233	144:4	44n85
		149:4	72n159
8:2	198n72	Proverbs	
8:4–5	100	6:13	60n133
8:5	35, 35n61, 52	8:22	155n208
8:6	66–67, 69, 124n103	10:10	60n133
8:6–7	68n152	16:30	60n133
8:7	69, 161, 162n226, 164n234, 164, 172, 174, 190	Job	
		1:5	59
9:28 LXX	213	1:6	59, 101
13:1–3 LXX	213	1:21	34n57, 48
14:1b	51n106	2:1	59, 101
14:3	51n106	3:12	35n61
16:15	151n191	4:16	151n191
21:4–7	67	4:17	59
21:6	124n102	4:17–21	51n106, 225
22:15	62n136	4:19	139n160
28:1	101	5:9	60
30:10	45	6:11	35n61
35:2 LXX	213	7:1–2	59
35:19	60n133	7:16	44n85
36:10	77	7:17	35n61
51	6, 53n111	9–10	59
51:7	53	9:10	60
51:12–14	77	9:33	60
51:16	53n111	9:34	59
53:2b	51n106	10:9	37n68, 139n160
53:4	51n106	10:15	34n57
		12:13	60

13:22 59
 13:24 60
 14:1ff. 52, 52n108
 14:12 126
 15:7–8 90
 15:8 60, 74
 15:14 35n61, 52, 59
 15:14–16 51n106, 52, 225
 16:18–20 60
 16:20 63n139
 19:23–27 60
 21:15 35n61
 25:4 52, 59
 25:4–6 51n106, 52, 225
 30:19 40, 60n134
 31:37 60
 32:8 41
 33:6 36, 37n68, 40, 60,
 139n160
 33:23 63, 63n139
 37:14 60
 38:1 60, 62
 38:2 60
 38:2–3 61
 38:3 60
 38:4–7 59, 63
 38:7 63, 64, 101, 124n102
 40:3 60
 40:4–5 60, 61
 40:6 60, 62
 40:6–13 226
 40:7 60
 40:7–8 61
 41:3 225
 42:2–6 60
 42:3 60, 61
 42:5 60
 42:6 40, 60, 61, 62, 63
 42:7–8 60
 42:7–10 63
 42:12 63

Ecclesiastes

3:20 45n88
 5:15 48
 7:20 35, 213
 12:7 45n88

Daniel

2 164
 2:44 165n239, 170
 2:45 170
 3:19 151n193
 4:36 151n193
 5:6 151n193
 5:9 151n193
 5:10 151n193
 7 164
 7:9–14 170
 7:13 165n239
 7:26–27 165n239, 170–171
 7:28 151n193
 8:10 124n102
 9:7–10 32n52
 10:13 73n164
 10:20 73n164
 10:21 73n164
 11:36 158n213
 12:1 73n164
 12:2–3 125

Ezra

7:27 72n159
 8:24–29 73n164
 9:15 32n52
 10:5 73n164

Nehemiah

9:33 32n52

1 Chronicles

15:22 73n164
 17:16 35n61
 24:5 73n164
 29:14 35n61

2 Chronicles

2:6 35n61
 36:14 73n164

Deuterocanon and Pseudepigrapha

Apocalypse of Abraham

23 204n90
 24:9 205

Apocalypse of Moses

7:1	185n35
8:2	66n145, 185n35
10:1ff.	163n232
10:2	185n35
11:1–3	185n35
19:3	204n90, 205
20:1	145n177
20:1–2	10n33
21:1–6	10n33
21:2	185n35
23:3	185n35
24:1	185n35
24:4	185n35
25	204n90
25:1	185n35
25:3	205
32:2	207
39:1	185n35

Apocalypse of Sedrach

4:4	185n35
-----	--------

Baruch

4:1	186n41
-----	--------

2 Baruch

4:3	185n35
17:1–18:2	185n35
21:12	161n223
31:6–32:7	220
48:14–17	35n63
48:42–43	167n245
48:49	161n223
51:7–17	103
52:7	161n223
54:15	167n245
54:19	200
56:5	216
56:5–7	167n245

3 Baruch

6:16	145n177
------	---------

1 Enoch

6–36	6
14:20	151n194
15	104n29
15:6–7	58n128

15:8–16:3

32:6

45:1–3c

45:4–5

55:3–4

61:8

62:1–6

62:15

69:29

72:1

104:2

104:6

2 Enoch

12:1

14:3

15:1

16:7

22:8

30:10–11

30:12

30:15–31

44:1

58:4

65:8–11

3 Enoch

6:2–3

48D:8

4 Ezra

3:4–27

3:7

3:20–23

3:21–22

4:30–32

7:10

7:10–12

7:11

7:14

7:21

7:30–31

7:75

7:83

8:34

9:20

13:18

16:12

38

184n35

170n254

220

170n254

170n254

170n254

151n192

170n254

146n179

125

125

167n247

167n247

167n247

167n247

145n177, 151n192

10n33

145n177

185n35

112

163n232

220

58n128

58n128

182n26

185n35

185n35

182n26

182n26

116n76

216

185n35

161n223

185n35

220

220

161n223

35n63

216

161n223

124

Hellenistic Synagogal Prayers		1:38–55	167n245
12:44–46	185n35	1:51–53	185n35
		3:8	149
History of the Rechabites		3:757	186n41
7:8	185n35	8:256–273	149
Joseph and Aseneth		Sirach	
8:10–11	146n179	10:9	60n134
		10:18	52
Jubilees		11:11	211n106
2–3	184n35	15:11–20	6, 213n110
2:2	167n247	15:14–15	218n129
2:7	10n33	15:14–17	205
2:33	186n41	16:30	48
3:8–14	49	17:1–24	6
3:9–31	10n33	17:3	112n59, 149n183
3:28	163n232	17:11–12	66n145, 184n35
4:26	146n179, 220	17:14	184n35
6:4	186n41	17:32	60n134
7:20–33	38	18:8	35n63
11:4	38	24:23	155n207
22:12	42n81	25:24	6, 167n245, 207
Liber antiquitatum biblicarum		33:10–13	6
13:8–9	185n35	40:1	48
		40:3	60n134
Life of Adam and Eve		45:15	126
18:1	185n35	49:8	151n194
26:2	185n35	49:16	10n33, 65
34	216		
34:1–3	185n35	Testament of Abraham	
37:2	185n35	13:11	167n247
38:2	185n35		
49:1–3	185n35	Testament of Solomon	
		18:1–2	167n247
2 Maccabees			
15:10	186n40	Wisdom of Solomon	
		2:23	70, 112n59, 149n183,
4 Maccabees			152, 177n5
17:5	125	3:7	125
18:8	204n90	7:1–6	200n78
		7:17–19	167n247
Psalms of Solomon		7:25	124
17:24	166n244	7:25–26	155n208
		7:26	112n61, 149n183
Sibylline Oracles		13:1–3	167n247
1:22–24	116n76	14:12	218
1:38–45	185n35	14:25	218
		14:31	186n40

Dead Sea Scrolls**1QapGen (Genesis Apocryphon)**

VI 1–2 53n112

1QM (War Scroll)

VIII 4–7 56n119

XI 6 42n81

XIII 10–18 31

XVII 19 78n177

1QS (Serek ha-Yahad)

III 13 21

III 13–15 24

III 13–IV 26 9, 19, 20, 29, 54

III 15–16 27

III 17–18 67n148, 68, 69, 84, 86,

92n218

III 17–19 67, 94, 200

III 17–21 205

III 18 67

III 23 69

IV 6–8 66, 76, 78, 86

IV 18 69

IV 18–20 66, 67

IV 19 66, 67

IV 20 38, 67

IV 20–21 68

IV 20–22 50n103

IV 20–23 66, 78

IV 22–23 67, 69

IV 23 65, 67n148, 68n153, 86

IV 25 67

IV 25–26 74

IV 25–27 67

V 13–15 47n95

VI 24–25 47n95

VIII 5–10 74

VIII 16–18 47n95

IX 12 21

X–XI 19, 21, 25

XI 5–15 54–55

XI 7–9 74, 82n193

XI 7–10 200

XI 9 34

XI 9–10 33

XI 9–11 32n51

XI 9–15 27–28, 36n65

XI 13 53n112

XI 14–15 51

XI 20–22 32n51

XI 20 52n109

XI 21 50n102, 52

XI 22 36, 60n132

1QSa (Rule of the Congregation)

II 3–9 56n119

1QSB (Rule of Benedictions)

IV 24–26 73

IV 24–28 76

1QH^a (Hodayot)

I–VIII 21n18

III 27–32 32n51

III 29 44, 78

IV 13–20 38, 69

IV 26–27 65, 69, 86

IV 27 9, 68n150, 70, 221

IV 29 26n35

IV 29–32 32n51

IV 32 33

IV 33–37 31

IV 35–37 26n35, 38, 41–42, 69

IV 37 24n31, 26n35

IV 38 66, 77, 77n177

IV 38–40 65, 69, 77

IV 39 68n150, 70

V 12 21, 28

V 12–14 23–24

V 14 26n35

V 15 24n31

V 15–30 24

V 20–23 28

V 30 24n31

V 30–31 34

V 30–32 69, 70

V 30–33 6, 34n57

V 30–35 32n51

V 30–36 40–41

V 31 44, 52

V 31–33 24, 44, 49, 51, 52, 56

V 32 7, 50n102

V 32–33 26n35, 34, 34n57, 42,

43

V 33–35 69, 72n159

V 34 34, 84

V 34–35 42, 86, 221

V 35-36	77	XI 20-23	32n51
V 36	33	XI 20-24	9n28, 55-56
VI 16-17	73n166, 82n193, 84	XI 21-24	56n117, 82n193
VI 18	42n80, 70n156	XI 21-25	139n160
VI 22-23	26n35	XI 22	73n166
VI 22-27	24	XI 23-25	34
VI 23-24	41	XI 24-25	200
VI 26-27	33	XI 24-26	31
VI 28-33	21n23	XI 24b-26	32n51
VII	26n35	XI 25	50n102
VII 12	84	XII	54n114
VII 17-18	82n193	XII 6	84
VII 21	21	XII 6-7	76
VII 25-27	31	XII 23-24	82n193
VII 25-35	29n43	XII 30-31	33, 36n65, 44, 53
VII 27-33	25	XII 30-13+32-34	77
VII 28-30	55, 56n117	XII 30-34	31, 32n51
VII 34	32n51	XII 30-41	6
VII 34-35	35n63, 45n89	XII 31-32	33
VII 35	45n89	XII 32	45n89
VIII 12-14	32n51	XII 32-33	42n79
VIII 14	84	XII 34-35	63n137
VIII 14-16	82n193, 86	XII 37-38	33
VIII 18	46n91, 50n103	XII 41	33
VIII 18-21	42n79	XIII 9-11	85
VIII 27	33	XIII 17-21	85
IX 2	45n87	XIII 27-28	85
IX 8	33	XIV 12-15	74
IX 10-11	45n89	XIV 15-17	74, 82n193, 86
IX 11-21	28, 92	XIV 15-21	71
IX 17	45n89	XIV 16	63, 73
IX 22	31, 46n91	XIV 16-17	84
IX 23	34, 50n102	XIV 19-21	76
IX 23-24	34	XV 7	62n136
IX 23-25	6, 32, 49, 51, 56	XV 10	77, 77n177
IX 23b-29	32n51	XV 20-21	31
IX 24	7, 49n102, 51	XV 21-22	75, 77n174
IX 24-25	42n79, 46n89	XV 21-24	71n157
IX 25	43n84	XV 25-28	84, 85
IX 27-28	33	XV 26-27	73n166
IX 29-30	45n89	XV 27-28	76
IX 31-35	45n89	XV 29-36	31
IX 35	85	XV 31	44n85, 88
X-XVII	85	XV 31-36	32n51
X 8-16	85	XV 34-XXVI 9	8
XI 4	76	XV 35	32, 44, 78
XI 4-5	84	XV 35-36	35n63
XI 6-30	6, 8	XV 37-XVI 4	31
XI 8-14	49n102	XV 38-40	32n51

1QH^a (Hodayot) (cont.)

XV 39-40	6, 32, 33, 53	XX 25-27	21n23
XVI 5	75	XX 27	34, 36, 40, 139n160
XVI 5-28	71, 145	XX 27-28	7, 34, 34n57, 36, 44, 234
XVI 7	72	XX 27-29	49, 51, 56
XVI 11-14	74, 82n193, 86	XX 27-31	37n68, 43, 60, 200-201
XVI 12-14	72	XX 27-39	32n51
XVI 17	73, 75	XX 28	50n102
XVI 19	75	XX 29	44
XVI 21	70, 72n159, 75, 82n193,	XX 29-30	167n245
	86	XX 30-31	60, 201
XVI 23-24	78n177	XX 33-34	33
XVI 34	78n177	XX 35	61
XVII 9-10	33	XXI-XXII	85
XVII 24-28	67n147	XXI 2	44, 52, 52n109, 61
XVII 25	85	XXI 2-3	32n51
XVII 26-27	76, 77, 77n174	XXI 7	61
XVII 26-28	84	XXI 7-13	32n51
XVII 38-XVIII 14	31	XXI 9	52, 82n193
XVIII 4-9	39-40	XXI 9-10	61
XVIII 5-6	60n132	XXI 15-16	62
XVIII 5-7	35n63	XXI 20-21	62
XVIII 5-8	32	XXI 24-26	32n51, 34, 62
XVIII 5-9	34	XXI 25	63
XVIII 5-14	32n51	XXI 25-26	60n134
XVIII 6	36	XXI 26	62
XVIII 7	60n134	XXI 30	44, 50n102, 78
XVIII 10	73n164, 92	XXI 31-38	32n51
XVIII 24	45n89	XXI 35-36	62
XVIII 25	25n31	XXII 8	32n51
XVIII 26-32	25	XXII 12	32n51
XVIII 34-35	63n137	XXII 19	32n51
XIX 7-8	86	XXII 24-28	82n194
XIX 10-12	33	XXII 28-30	32n51
XIX 13-17	55, 56n117, 82n193	XXIII 2-9	84
XIX 15	31, 32, 42n79	XXIII 13-14	44, 52, 52n109
XIX 20-21	33	XXIII 24-28	32n51
XIX 21	33	XXIII 26-30	82n193
XIX 22-24	32	XXIII 27	60n134
XIX 22-25	31, 32n51, 201n80	XXIII 28, 36	50n102
XX-XXI	233	XXIII 29-30	77
XX-XXII	32n50, 60-64	XXIII 30-35	78
XX 5-6	82n193	XXIII 31-32	84
XX 7	21	XXIII 37-38	51
XX 2-27	28-29	XXIV	38n72
XX 7-27	60	XXIV 6	25n31
XX 14	21	XXIV 8-10	38
XX 22-23	33	XXIV 11-12	84
		XXIV 26	38, 84

XXIV 33–34	84	4Q171 (pPs ^a)	
XXV 26–27	82n193, 84	II 27–III 2	65
XXV 32–33	86		
XXV 34	21	4Q174 (Flor)	
XXV 34–XXVII 3	79, 158	I 1 6	73
XXV 35–36	35n63		
XXV 37	83	4Q175 (Test)	
XXVI 2	84, 86	13	42n81
XXVI 3–4	84		
XXVI 4	83n195	4Q256 (S ^b)	
XXVI 4–5	83, 87	XIX–XX	19
XXVI 5–6	83, 85		
XXVI 6	82	4Q257 (S ^c)	
XXVI 7	82, 83	V	19, 20
XXVI 8–9	91n215		
XXVI 9	81n189, 82, 85	4Q258 (QS ^d)	
XXVI 9–14	82	VIII–X	19
XXVI 11–12	83, 85		
XXVI 15	85	4Q260 (QS ^f)	
XXVI 15–16	83	II–V	10
XXVI 26–30	83		
XXVI 27	85	4Q264 (Halakhah B)	
XXVI 27–30	56n117, 82, 83	I 9	50n102
XXVI 29	85		
XXVI 31a–34	85	4Q265 (Miscellaneous Rules)	
XXVI 32ff.	85	7 11–17	49
XXVI 32–40	32n51		
XXVI 35	60n134	CD (Damascus Document)	
XXVI 35–36	34, 82, 86	II 14–III 12	39n75
XXVI 36–40	63	II 16	39n75
XXVI 36–41	84	II 21	184n35
frg. 2 i 8	50n102	III 8	184n35
frg. 2 i 16	50n102	III 18–IV 4	65
frg. 6	83n195	III 20	68n150
frg. 7	83n196	VII 21	42n81
frg. 10	73n166	IX 16–23	47n95
frg. 12	73n166		
frg. 13	86n202	4Q267 (D ^b)	
frg. 15a	23	I 5	60n134
frg. 15b i	23		
frg. 24	53n87	4Q274 (Tohorot A)	
frg. 31	23	I 11–4	47n95
frg. 47	82n194, 83n195		
frg. 47 2	82n194	4Q301 (Myst ^{c?})	
frg. C2 2	84	4 3	35n63
		5 3	35n63
4Q167 (pHos ^b)			
7–8	66n145	4Q368 (apocrPent A)	
7–8 1	184n35	3 7	63n139

- 4Q374 (Discourse on the Exodus)
 7 2 63n139
- 4Q381 (Non-Canonical Psalms B)
 1 10–11 73n164
- 4Q400 (ShirShabb^a)
 2 6–8 32n51
- 4Q403 (ShirShabb^d)
 1 31 92
- 4Q416 (Instruction^b)
 2 ii 2–3 43n82
- 4Q417 (Instruction^c)
 1 i 14–18 42
 1 i 15 42n81
 1 i 16 42nn80,81
 1 i 16–17 70
 1 i 16–18 92n218
 1 i 17 149n183
 2 ii 4 43n82
- 4Q419 (Sap. Work B)
 8 ii 7 43n82
- 4Q427 (H^a)
 6 2 83n195
 7 i + ii 79
 7 i 8 83
 7 i 9 83, 85, 87
 7 i 10 82
 7 i 11 82, 83
 7 i 12–13 91n215
 7 i 13 81n189, 82, 85
 7 i 13–18 82
 7 i 16 83, 85
 7 i 19 84–85
 7 i 19–20 83
 7 i 20 85
 7 ii 2–7 57n122
 7 ii 7–9 83
 7 ii 7–11 82
 7 ii 8 85
 7 ii 12–16 85
 7 ii 14ff. 85
 7 ii 16 60n134
 7 ii 16–18 82, 86
- 7 ii 18–21 63
 7 ii 18–22 84
 7 ii 20 85
 8 ii 10 21
 11 1–5 62
 11 3 62n136
- 4Q428 (H^b)
 10 1–6 53n112
 12 ii 3 21
 13 1–2 62
 13 8 62n136
 20 3–4 86
 21 79
- 4Q431 (H^e)
 1 19n4
 1 1 84, 86
 1 3 83n195, 87
 1 4 83, 87, 88
 1 4–5 87
 1 5 83
 1 6 82, 87
 1 6–7 83
 1 13 84
 2 6–9 82
- 4Q433 (Hodayot-like text A)
 1 1–10 32n51
- 4Q444 (Incantation)
 1 2–4 38
 1 8 38
- 4Q491 (M^a)
 11 19, 79n182, 80,
 80nn183,185, 81
 11 5 82, 82n194
 11 9 84n200, 87n203
 11 11 83n195
 11 12 81n189
 11 13 82n192
- 4Q504 (DibHam^a)
 6 10–12 76
 8 *recto* 1–10 92n218
 8 *recto* 4 65, 70, 76, 149n183, 152
 8 *recto* 4–9 66n145, 184n35
 8 *recto* 5 46n89

4Q511 (Shir^b)
 28+29 2-5 32n51
 28+29 3 50n102
 28+29 4 36, 45n87, 50n102,
 60n132
 48, 49+51 2-3 38
 48, 49+51 3-4 38-39
 126 2 60n134

4Q512 (papRitPur B)
 29-32 8-9 47n95

11Q10 (tgJob)
 XXXIV 2 62
 XXXIV 8-9 63n138
 XXXVII 7-9 62-63

11Q19 (11QT^a)
 XV 11 78n177

Ancient Jewish Writers

Josephus
Contra Apionem
 2.190-191 149

Antiquitates judaicae
 1.40-47 185n35
 3.218 186n40

Bellum judaicum
 6.47 167n247

Philo
De agricultura
 51 100n19

De cherubim
 125 109n51

De confusione linguarum
 146-167 155n208

De vita contemplativa
 3-5 167n247

De decalogo
 49-50 209
 53 167n247

142 205
 150-153 205
 173 205

De fuga et inventione
 101 100n19

Quis rerum divinarum heres sit
 293-299 199

Legum allegoriae
 1.90 208
 1.90-108 185n35
 1.92 208
 1.93-95 209
 1.105-108 205
 2.53 209
 2.53-64 199n73
 2.72 204n90
 2.74 204n90
 3.101 142n165

Legatio ad Gaium
 210-211 149
 346 149

De opificio mundi
 3 185n35
 15f. 97n7
 134 135n138
 152 204n90
 156 199n73
 157-160 204n90

De plantatione
 44 209
 44-45 185n35

De praemiis et poenis
 114 139n157

Quod omnis probus liber sit
 62 139n157

Quaestiones et solutiones in Genesin
 1.15 185n35
 1.25 97n7
 1.47-48 204n90

<i>De somniis</i>		1:26	218n129
1.232–233	149	1:27	207
1.238	149	1:28	218n129
		1:32	191n53
<i>De specialibus legibus</i>		2:12	185n36
4.84–94	205	2:14–15	213n110
		2:15	185n36
		2:23	186n40
New Testament		2:26	191n53
		3:9	178, 181
Matthew		3:10–18	213
11:11	52	3:19	213n110
13:43	125	3:19–20	203n83
18:6	198n72	3:20	181, 185n36
19:20	211n106	3:21	184, 206
24:14	169n251	3:21–26	193n58
24:30	124	3:23	13, 145n177, 211n106
		3:25	192n53
Luke		3:28	206
1:6	191n53	3:31	184
3:38	100, 102n23	4	220
7:25	151n192	4:6	206
7:28	52	4:13	221
15:24	203n85	4:15	186, 186n40
15:32	203n85	4:17	177n7, 191n52
20:35–36	103	5	132n132, 133n135, 145n177
John		5–8	194
14:2	161n223	5:3–4	224
17:5	151n191	5:9–10	192n58
		5:12	13, 176–184, 187, 201, 203, 203n87, 207, 211n106, 218n129, 220
Acts		5:12ff.	14, 133n134
7:27	181	5:12–14	181n27, 184–187, 194, 205
Romans		5:12–21	139n158, 175, 199, 201, 213n110
1–2	213n112	5:13	201n81
1–4	94, 195	5:13–14	177n13, 181, 202n83, 205
1:3	139n158, 189n46, 213n113	5:14	139n158, 178, 187, 188, 188n45, 201
1:16–17	192n53	5:15	180
1:18–23	177n7	5:15–17	177n3
1:18–28	135	5:15–20	187–195
1:20	217	5:16	181
1:20–23	211n106	5:17	168n248, 177, 177n8, 178, 180, 215n118
1:21	218n129	5:18	177n3, 181
1:23	131n128, 145n177, 211n106		
1:24	218n129		
1:25	177n7		

5:19	177n3, 181, 182	8:15–17	221
5:20	184, 186, 187n42, 201n81	8:17	215n18
5:21	168n248, 177n3, 178	8:18–23	176, 177nn7, 8, 178,
6:4	177n3		215–227
6:6	213	8:19–21	13
6:7	194	8:19–23	146n179
6:9	190n50	8:20	12
6:12	211, 219	8:21–22	19
6:13	214n114	8:26–27	215n18
6:19	177n3, 214n114	8:28	224
6:23	182	8:28–30	140n161, 188
7	145n177	8:29	100, 101, 135n138, 139,
7:1–6	197n70, 202n83, 204		150, 221, 222, 222n147,
7:4–6	213n110		224
7:5	207n100, 210, 211, 213	8:29–30	215n18
7:7	197n70	8:32	220, 221
7:7–12	168n248, 176, 181, 183,	8:38	168n248
	183n27, 184, 184n34,	8:38–39	13, 170n253
	187n42, 192, 194,	9:4	184, 220
	195–215, 221	9:19–24	177n7, 224
7:7–13	133n134	9:20	183n27
7:7–25	200, 202n83, 206n97,	9:21	124n104
	207	11:23–24	177n7
7:12	184	11:30–31	177n3
7:13	196	11:32	183n27, 224
7:13–25	197n70, 211n107	11:32–33	224
7:14	212, 212n109	11:35	225
7:14–21	198n71	11:36	173n261, 177n7, 225
7:14–25	197, 197nn69, 70, 198,	12:2	144, 145
	201, 212, 212n110,	12:4–5	104n29
	213n110	14:9	203n85
	212n110	16:20	166n244, 168n248
7:15–21			
7:18	213, 214n114		
7:22	212n110	1 Corinthians	
7:23	211, 214n114	1:8	169n251
7:24	197	1:9	172
8:1–7	215n18	1:18–29	166n244
8:2	192n53	1:30	172
8:2–4	213n110	2:6	170n253, 173
8:3	139n158, 161n225,	2:7–8	125n105
	189n46, 195, 206n97,	2:8	170n253, 173
	213	2:9	172
8:3–4	194	2:10–3:1	144n175
8:4	191n53	2:13–14	125n106
8:9–11	128	2:13–15	212n109
8:12–30	190n49	3:1	125n106, 210, 212n109
8:14–15	220	3:21–23	172, 173n261
8:14–17	215n18	4:7	172
8:15	216n122, 220	4:8	172

1 Corinthians (cont.)		15:1-12	125n105
6:2	177n8	15:3	167
6:2-3	172	15:3-4	118n80
6:9	207	15:12-19	164
6:13	166n244	15:17	118n80, 167
6:14-20	166n243	15:18	166n244
6:15-16	204	15:20-23	139
6:16	116n77, 166n242	15:20-24	164-168, 173n261
7	105	15:20-28	95, 115n71, 146n179, 154, 161n225, 162-174, 178, 221, 229
7:31	146n179		133, 189n46
8:5-6	135	15:21	118n80, 162, 174
8:6	115n71, 137, 139n157, 141n164, 154, 155n207, 172, 173n261	15:21-22	174
		15:22	170
9:1-2	125n105	15:22-23	170, 170n253, 172, 173
10:1-4	166n243	15:24	104n29
10:4	141n164, 154, 172	15:24-25	126, 158, 168-174, 215n118, 220, 221
10:6	188	15:24-28	162n226
10:9	141n164, 154, 172		105n32
10:11	188	15:27	104n29
10:16-17	166n243	15:27-28	164n236
10:26	135, 154	15:28	119, 123n100
11:2-16	105, 106	15:29	118n80, 125n105, 135, 135n138, 174, 219n134
11:3	105n32, 106, 106n35, 115, 116, 138n157, 158	15:35	119, 121-126
11:4-6	105n32, 106, 107, 112	15:35-50	122n94
11:7	12, 13, 15, 15n59, 98, 130, 131n128, 134, 135, 138n153, 156, 157, 145n177, 151n194, 166n242, 175, 182n23, 211n106, 213, 222n147	15:36-44	131n128, 151n194
		15:39	211n106
		15:40	219
		15:40-49	119-120
		15:42	133n133, 160n221, 219, 223n151
11:7-12	95, 104, 105-117, 131, 135n138, 146	15:42-43	138n153
		15:42-44	143n170
11:11-12	97n8	15:44-50	139, 166n243
11:13-14	112n60		144n175, 166n242, 167n246, 212n109, 213
11:13-16	106n35, 108, 112	15:45	13, 15, 16, 95, 104, 117-135, 135, 145n177, 162, 167, 174, 175, 182n23, 210, 215n118, 221, 222, 222n147, 223
11:14-15	106	15:45-49	139, 146n178, 219
12:4-6	115n71		152n98
12:6	173n261	15:45-50	15, 16, 139n159, 159, 166n243, 172
12:12-13	166n243		123n100, 168, 173n261
12:12-31	104n29		
12:13	96, 96n1, 105		
13:8	166n244		
13:11	166n244, 198	15:47	
13:12	130	15:48	
14:20	198n72	15:49	
14:33-36	105n32		
15	13	15:50	

15:50-52	104n29	5:1	140, 161n223
15:53-54	130n123	5:1-4	126
15:53-55	174	5:1-5	129n120, 143, 143n169
15:54-55	133, 167	5:3	145n177
15:55-56	168n248	5:4	145n177, 179n14
15:56	118n80, 133, 167n246	5:5	141, 144, 215n118
		5:17	146
2 Corinthians		5:17-18	173n261
2:11	168n248	5:21	145n176
3-4	135n138, 161	6:8	112n60
3:3	144n173, 212n109	11:2	204
3:4-18	135	11:3	168n248, 178, 204, 207,
3:6	144n173		214n117
3:7	140	12:1-9	214n117
3:7-8	144n173	12:2-4	125, 126
3:7-11	143n169, 143n169	12:7	168n248
3:7-18	140		
3:7-4:6	77n174	Galatians	
3:12-13	140	1:8-9	124n102
3:13	140	2:4	187
3:13-16	142n165	3-4	220
3:15-17	144n173	3:5-7	101
3:18	16, 95, 131n128, 135-146,	3:6	102
	142, 150, 215n118,	3:8	102
	222n147, 229	3:14	102
3:18-4:6	162	3:16	101
4:2	144-145	3:17	205
4:4	16, 95, 112n61, 131n128,	3:19	186n40
	136-139, 141, 143, 144,	3:19-20	187n42
	146, 151, 154, 168n248,	3:21	102, 187
	172, 173	3:23-25	102n25
4:4-6	156	3:24	210
4:6	16, 95, 112n61, 136-139,	3:26	102
	141, 143, 144, 146, 172,	3:28	15, 95, 96, 96n1, 101,
	222n147		102n24, 105, 106, 111,
4:7	140		116, 134, 135n138, 146,
4:7-10	142n165		175
4:7-5:5	139	3:29	102
4:7-5:21	145n177	4:1-6	210
4:16	146	4:1-7	102n25
4:16-5:10	146n178	4:1-9	102n25
4:17-5:1	146	4:3	13, 99, 161n225, 168,
4:8-11	146		170n253
4:12	140	4:3-6	102
4:14	140	4:4	52, 156
4:16	139, 140, 143n169, 146	4:5	220
4:16-18	146	4:9	13, 99, 168, 170n253
4:17	143, 143n169	4:21-31	102, 188n45
4:18	144	4:21-5:1	102n25

Galatians (cont.)		3:20–21	95, 135n138, 140n161, 147, 147n180, 151n194, 159–162, 222n147
4:26	125, 161n223		
5:1	104n29		
5:11	166n244	3:21	124n104, 125, 139, 143n170, 151, 151n194, 215n118, 222
5:16–26	213n110		
5:18	210		
5:19	210	4:10	179n14
5:22–23	210	4:12	147n180
6:8	218	4:14	114n66
6:14–15	99, 102n26		
6:15	99, 146n179	Colossians	
6:16	104n29	1:5	125
		1:12	125
Ephesians		1:13	100, 173n261
1:3	224n154	1:15	137, 139n157, 154–156, 156n209
1:5	220		
1:20–21	165n239, 170n253	1:15–16	100, 155
1:20–23	164n236, 173n261	1:15–20	154n206, 155n208, 172
1:22	105n32	1:16	13, 170n253
2:2	167n247, 173	1:20	13
5:22–23	105n32	2:6–3:4	164n236
6:12	170n253, 173	2:8	170n253
		2:10	105n32, 170n253
Philippians		2:15	13, 170n253
1:20–24	147n180	2:17	188
1:27	161	2:20	170n253
2:1–5	159	2:24	218
2:5–11	14, 95, 147, 147n180, 157–162, 162	3:4	143n170
	137, 139n157, 147–156, 157, 160, 172	3:9–11	156n209
2:6		3:10	97n8, 112n59, 155, 156n209
2:6–7	222n147	3:10–11	96n1
2:6–9	159–162	3:11	96, 96n1
2:7	153, 157, 160n219		
2:7–11	161n225	1 Thessalonians	
2:8	160n221	1:7	188
2:10	158n213	2:20	108n46
2:10–11	161		
2:15	198n72	2 Thessalonians	
2:20–21	147n180	1:9	166n244
2:25–30	147n180	2:1–12	13
3:2–21	147n180	2:4	158n213
3:8–14	160	2:8	166n244
3:11	152n199	3:9	188
3:12	179n14		
3:16	114n66	1 Timothy	
3:17	188	2:11–13	105n32
3:18–21	160n221, 161	2:11–15	207
3:19	108n46, 112n60	2:14	186n40, 204

- | | | | |
|----------------|-----------------|-----------------------|---------|
| 2:20 | 124n104 | b. Sanhedrin | |
| 4:12 | 188 | 38b | 202n83 |
| | | 56b | 185n35 |
| Hebrews | | 102a | 202n83 |
| 1:2–3 | 101 | | |
| 1:3 | 112n61, 151n91 | Deuteronomy Rabbah | |
| 1:14 | 124n102 | 2:25 | 185n35 |
| 2:2 | 186n40 | | |
| 2:14 | 168 | Exodus Rabbah | |
| 9:1 | 191n53 | 21:1 | 202n83 |
| 9:10 | 191n53 | 30:7 | 202n83 |
| 9:15 | 186n40 | 32:1 | 202n83 |
| 12:22 | 161n223 | 32:7 | 202n83 |
| 12:22–23 | 124n102 | 32:11 | 202n83 |
| | | | |
| James | | Fragmentary Targum | |
| 1:15 | 205 | 2:15 | 185n35 |
| 2:17 | 203n87 | | |
| 2:26 | 203n87 | Genesis Rabbah | |
| 3:9 | 112n59, 149n183 | 8:1 | 97n7 |
| 4:4 | 181 | 8:2 | 185n35 |
| | | 8:9 | 108 |
| 1 Peter | | 16:5–6 | 185n35 |
| 3:21b–22 | 164n236 | 20:12 | 145n177 |
| 3:22 | 165n239 | 21 | 10n33 |
| 5:3 | 188 | 22:2 | 108 |
| | | 24:5 | 185n35 |
| 2 Peter | | | |
| 1:4 | 218 | m. 'Abot | |
| 2:12 | 218 | 3:14 | 186n41 |
| 2:19 | 218 | | |
| 3:13 | 220 | m. Šabbat | |
| | | 140b | 49n102 |
| Revelation | | | |
| 2:25 | 114n66 | Midrash Genesis | |
| 12:4 | 124n102 | 14 | 33n56 |
| 14:4–8 | 158n213 | | |
| 15:4 | 191n53 | Mekilta Pisha | |
| 18:1 | 124 | 14 | 97n7 |
| 19:8 | 191n53 | | |
| 20:5 | 203n85 | Midrash Proverbs | |
| 21–22 | 220 | 8:4 | 185n35 |
| | | | |
| | | Midrash Psalms | |
| Rabbinic Works | | 1:10 | 185n35 |
| | | 6:2 | 185n35 |
| b. Megillah | | | |
| 9a | 97n7 | Pesiqta de Rab Kahana | |
| | | 12:1 | 185n35 |

Pirque Rabbi Eliezer

13 185n35

Targum Neofiti

2:15 185n35

3:9 185n35

3:22–24 185n35

Targum Pseudo-Jonathan

2:15 185n35

3:9–11 185n35

3:15 185n35

3:22–22 185n35

y. Berakot

9:1 108

Early Christian Writings

Augustine

De civitate Dei

13.22 117n79

2 Clement

12:2 97n7

Clement of Alexandria

Stromateis

3:13.92 97n7

Gospel of Thomas

21a–22 97n7

37 97n7

Justin Martyr

Dialogus cum Tryphone

61.1 152n197

114 152n197

126.1 152n197

127.4 152n197

Origen

Contra Celsum

7.62 149–150

7.66 150

Pseudo-Clementines

Homiliae

XVII.7 152n197

Recognitiones

1.28 152n197

Theodore of Mopsuestia

Pauline Commentary

15:195 117n79

Greco-Roman Literature

Aristotle

Politica

1.1252a–b 109n51

Athenaeus

Deipnosophistae

2.49d 179n15

Corpus Hermeticum

1.12 150

12 152n97

Diogenes Laertius

Vitae philosophorum

7.169.4–6 179n15

Epictetus

Diatribai

1.10.7–9 200n74

2.26.1 200n74

Euripides

Hippolytus

377–383 200n74

Medea

1077–1080 200n74

Plato

Respublica

6.5–8 100n19

Timaeus

92C 100n19

Plutarch			
<i>Agessilaus</i>		<i>De E apud Delphos</i>	
2.2	149	21, 393 D	100n19
<i>Aratus</i>		<i>Quaestionum convivialium libri IX</i>	
44.4.1	179n15	8.1, 718A	100n19
<i>Cimon</i>		<i>Quaestiones platonicae</i>	
8.6.4	179n15	2.1, 1000 B	100n19
		8.4, 1007 C	100n19
<i>De Alexandri magni fortuna aut virtute</i>			
335, C–D	149		